Legendary Rivals: Collegiality and Ambition in the Tales of Early Rome

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

JACLYN NEEL

BRILL

Legendary Rivals: Collegiality and Ambition in the Tales of Early Rome

Mnemosyne Supplements

MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Executive Editor

G.J. Boter
(*VU University Amsterdam*)

Editorial Board

A. Chaniotis (*Oxford*)
K.M. Coleman (*Harvard*)
I.J.F. de Jong (*University of Amsterdam*)
T. Reinhardt (*Oxford*)

VOLUME 372

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/mns*

Legendary Rivals: Collegiality and Ambition in the Tales of Early Rome

By

Jaclyn Neel

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Neel, Jaclyn.
Legendary rivals : collegiality and ambition in the tales of early Rome / by Jaclyn Neel.
pages cm. — (Mnemosyne supplements : monographs on Greek and Latin language and literature, ISSN 0169-8958 ; volume 372)
Summary: "In Legendary Rivals, Jaclyn Neel argues for a new interpretation of the foundation myths of Rome. Instead of a negative portrayal of the city's early history, these tales offer a didactic paradigm of the correct way to engage in competition. Accounts from the triumviral period stress the dysfunctional nature of the city's foundation to capture the memory of Rome's civil wars. Republican evidence suggests a different emphasis. Through diachronic analyses of the tales of Romulus and Remus, Amulius and Numitor, Brutus and Collatinus, and Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus, Neel shows that Romans of the Republic and early Principate would have seen these stories as examples of competition that pushed the bounds of propriety"—Provided by publisher.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-27269-9 (hardback : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-28185-1 (e-book)
1. Rome (Italy)—History—To 476—Sources. 2. Rome (Italy)—Civilization—Sources. 3. Competition (Psychology)—History—To 1500—Sources. 4. Tales—Italy—Rome. 5. Legends—Italy—Rome. 6. Mythology, Roman. 7. Rome (Italy)—Folklore. I. Title.

DG69.N33 2015
398'.3293763—dc23

2014029734

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978-90-04-27269-9 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-28185-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

For Saba and Sabta, Liza and Max, and Grandma, who taught me the power of ambition.

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction 1

1 **Setting the Stage** 3
- Doubling in Rome 5
- Methodologies 11
- Dyadic Rivals 14
- Situating the Problem 18
- Sources and Historicity 19
- Plan of the Argument 23

2 **Birds** 25
- Ennius 27
  - *The Fragment* 33
  - *The End of the Contest* 45
- Cassius Hemina 49
- Conclusion 53

3 **Invective** 54
- Romulus and Republican Politics 60
  - *Catullus* 62
  - *Sallust, [Sallust], and Cicero* 65
  - *Plutarch* 70
- Dionysius, Livy, and Late Republican Fragments 73
- Cicero 77
- Horace 82
- Conclusion 87

4 **Rites** 89
- The Lupercalia 91
  - *The Lupercalia of 44* 98
- The Parilia 103
- Quirinus 113
- Conclusion 117

5 **Art** 119
Republican Depictions 120
Augustan-Era Depictions 124
Castor and Pollux 134
Conclusion 137

6 **Walls** 140
Dionysius and Livy 142
Vergil 149
Propertius 152
Ovid 158
The Fasti 159
The Metamorphoses 169
Trogus 170
Conclusion: Romulus and Remus 173

7 **Parallels** 175
Romulus and Titus Tatius 176
Amulius and Numitor 181
Brutus the Liberator and Other Founders of the Republic 190
Conclusion 205

8 **Tyrants** 207
Manlius Capitolinus and Camillus 207
Regnum 220
The Rival-less *Rector* 225
Conclusion 233

Conclusion 236

Works Cited 242
Index 272

Acknowledgments

One often reads that acknowledgments are the most pleasant part of writing a book; less often, that they are among the most difficult. It is inevitable that over the course of a lengthy project one collects debts. I hope that here I have listed all of them, and sincerely apologize to anyone who feels misremembered.

This book grew largely out of my doctoral dissertation, which was supervised by Andreas Bendlin, Christer Bruun, Bjorn Ewald, and Jarrett Welsh. I thank Andreas and Jarrett in particular for patiently answering streams of emails, both before and after the defense. Hugh Mason, who was originally appointed to the committee *ex officio* and whose duties ended partway through its work, retained an interest in my project far beyond what was required of him. Similarly, I am grateful for Matt Roller for his thought-provoking comments as an external examiner.

A number of colleagues and friends have read the manuscript in whole or in part as it progressed from dissertation to book: Jeremy Armstrong, Cillian O'Hogan, Amy Russell, Donald Sells, and Jessica Westerhold read chapters or portions thereof; Becca Sears spent far too much of her vacation offering me a primer on literary theory; and Mary Beard, who read the entire manuscript with lightning speed and her usual acuity (although I suspect that she will still advise me to enjoy a problem). Any faults that remain in this work are due to my own stubborn persistence.

I would also like to thank my departmental colleagues in History and in the Classical Studies Programme at York University, who have been consistently welcoming and supportive over the past two years, and the Interlibrary Loan staff at Scott Library, whose promptness in fulfilling every request has never failed to amaze me.

I have presented parts of this work in various stages of completeness: at the annual meetings of the Classical Association of Canada in Vancouver, Halifax, and London, Ontario; at the annual meetings of the American Philological Association (now Society for Classical Studies) in San Antonio, Seattle, and Chicago; at works-in-progress meetings of the Collaborative Programme in Ancient History at the University of Toronto and at York University; at a Department of Classics Seminar at the University of Toronto; to members of the Department of Classics at Florida State University and UCLA; and as a research presentation in the Department of History, York University. I thank all audience members for their attention and their comments, and have indicated individual contributions in the notes where appropriate. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewer for Brill, whose comments encouraged me to rethink

several aspects of the work, and to Brill's production team, especially my editor Tessel Jonquière, for guiding me through the publication process.

Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends, especially my cousin Debbie, who read the entire manuscript for fun (!), Tamar, Tarley, and Ariane. I am also grateful to my immediate family: to my sisters Dana and Caroline, my parents, my grandmother, and my aunt Liza. All of them have been happy (or at least willing) to watch me practice presentations, rehearse drafts, or simply talk out my ideas. But I am most in debt to two people who are not relatives and who therefore had no obligation to listen. Alexa, who probably learned more about both academia and ancient history than she ever wished to know; and Chris, who read every draft, checked every translation, and has lived with Romulus, Camillus, and Brutus almost more than with me—thank you.

Introduction

In the wake of World War I, Adolf and Rudolf Dassler established a shoemaking company that would employ the majority of citizens in their small town. The brothers pooled their collective resources—both financial and intellectual—to make the company a success. And it was, at least for a little while. In spite of disagreements, Hitler, or even Rudolf's arrest and imprisonment by Allied forces, the company thrived.

And then something changed. There was an argument, a division of assets, and a "divorce".[1] The duo disbanded their company, Gebrüder Dassler, and established two competing businesses in its place. The feud divided their family and their town, and was not fully resolved even after the deaths of the siblings in the 1970s or the public reconciliation in 2009.[2] (For those who are concerned, the second companies—Adidas and Puma—are doing quite well.)

This type of competition, in which two former collaborators are torn apart by the desire to control their joint enterprise, is one we rarely hear about. Our culture embraces teamwork and celebrates the solitary genius; we frown upon disputes and betrayal. To a certain degree, so did Rome's. But as I will argue in this book, a not insubstantial chunk of Rome's mythic history was devoted to this very narrative: the unraveling of collegiality in the face of immense pressures and desires to succeed.

The most obvious example of such competition in Roman myth is the saga of the founders Romulus and Remus. But this book is only partly about them. Many scholars have patiently worked at the Gordian knot of the twins' story, and I make no claim to have sliced through it in the pages that follow. Indeed, my argument rests upon the notion that the goal of tales like Romulus and Remus' was to inspire conversations, debates, and speculation. My goal, in turn, is to analyze the destructive increase in competition during the Republic as viewed through Roman mythology. Romulus and Remus offer an obvious example of the potentially damaging nature of such competition; other legends that are built on a similar pattern show a preoccupation with its potential benefits. I argue, first, that such a narrative pattern exists; and second, that its main function in the Republic is to problematize elite competition, particularly as it appears in narratives about leaders and founders of Rome.

Historiographical and anthropological work on the retelling of history has shown that accounts of the legendary past are constructed to reaffirm core

1 Smit 2006:42.

2 Smit 2006:365–6; Hall 2009.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_002

values and solidify group belonging.[3] But the tale of Romulus and Remus, rather than solidifying Roman identity, seemed to split it. This is a well-known problem that has been tackled numerous times in the past two centuries of scholarship. Most familiar now is probably Peter Wiseman's work on the Remus legend; it has recently been supplemented by Marie ver Eecke's detailed study of Romulus.[4] These two works form a backdrop to my argument. While Wiseman was primarily concerned with the origins and early development of the twins' legend, ver Eecke followed the founder alone through the Republic, emphasizing the varying depictions of Romulus through a number of authors. As will be clear in later chapters, there are some aspects to their approaches that I disagree with; the majority of my concerns are different, however, and I have taken as a starting point some of their conclusions. Thus, I follow Wiseman in seeing the twins' tale as a politicized one, as well as one that took its best-known form(s) relatively late in Roman history; similarly, I agree that it did not begin as anti-Roman propaganda, although it may have been used as such by hostile authors. Like ver Eecke, I believe that the Romulus legend was undergoing re-evaluation over the course of the Republic, and that the rise of exceptionally powerful statesmen contributed to this evolution.

I differ from these works by examining the tale of the twins in a broader plane. Looking more closely at the accounts of the twins' relationship, rather than solely the death of Remus, I tried to reconstruct what the authors of these accounts expected their readers to respond to. What was new? What was familiar? And most importantly, once a reader had read about Romulus and Remus, what subsequent tales would trigger the memory of the twins?

These questions led me to other founders of Roman institutions: Amulius and Numitor, Romulus and Titus Tatius, Brutus and Collatinus, Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus. These legendary figures lived at different times in the city's history; Amulius and Numitor even predate Rome. But all of them shared a struggle for sole authority that seemed out of place in Republican narratives. This book analyzes that struggle as it evolves throughout the second and first centuries, from the earliest accounts in Fabius Pictor and Ennius to the latest examples of Republican writing: the representations of the Augustan age.

3 The bibliography on the creation and significance of legendary history is now vast. The standard work on the intersection of legends and oral history is still Vansina 1985. This has now been supplemented by more recent work on cultural memory; see the works on p. 12n37 and p. 13n39. See further e.g. Birth 2006 and White 2006, stressing the creation of group unity; Nicholson 2013 on the relationship between intertextuality and oral tradition in archaic Greece. Fox 1996 argues for a largely optimistic view of the regal period in ancient authors, which reinforces this perspective.

4 Wiseman 1995a; ver Eecke 2008.

CHAPTER 1

Setting the Stage

Ancient and modern analysts have praised the government of the Roman Republic for its dedication to shared power, which its leaders apparently achieved without significant dissent. Rome's 'mixed constitution' required multiple levels of cooperation to function: not only did Polybius' three main bodies of consul, senate, and people need to work together, but each level had to share power within itself. The consuls shared military and administrative power with each other; they would also ideally seek the advice of the previous possessors of this office, the senators. This more centralized, experienced authority was supplemented and offset by other offices. The Roman populace also had some degree of authority: it elected its magistrates, declared war and peace, and voted on laws. This system was perfectly balanced, according to Polybius, during its prime in the late third century BCE.[1]

The mixed constitution is also the government that Cicero praises in his treatise on the state, the *De Re Publica*.[2] But Cicero does not claim that the government still functions. Reconciliation of the ideal of shared power with the reality that individuals were granted exceptional powers with great frequency created anxieties that were increasingly transferred to accounts of the city's past. By constructing these accounts, writers suggested a way to explain and interpret the present. This present changed immensely over the course of the second and first centuries BCE, yielding a rich variety of foundation narratives and lessons for contemporary Roman elite readers.

The uneasy balance of individual and shared power appears in Rome's earliest history. For example, Livy praises the hero Camillus for sharing his power with a colleague, even when he is appointed chief of the consular tribunes; the

---

1 See Plb. 6.11.11 for praise; 6.11.1 for the date. Walbank's (1957) commentary on this section is still standard; see also Walbank 1943:79–81 for the argument that this section comprises Polybius' positive view of the still-functioning Roman political system. This is an obviously simplified outline of Republican government and does not enter into important debates in modern research, such as the potential role of the *plebs*; for this, see the works cited in n. 40. The Republican system of government has been extensively discussed in modern scholarship; see e.g. the survey of Staveley 1956; Lintott 1999; the reviews of scholarship in Flower 2010 and Hölkeskamp 2010:1–52 is also useful.

2 Cic. *DRP* 1.70–71; this praise arguably extends to the end of book 2, but at the most moderate measure includes the foundation of the Republic at 2.47. A thorough comparison of Cicero's and Polybius' versions of the state is made by Asmis 2005.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_003

praise suggests that the action was atypical.[3] In Roman authors' reconstruction of their own history, we might expect to find the fulfillment of the Republican ideal: that two men in power on the whole worked together without dispute and in the interest of the state.[4] But this is often not the case. Many of the major players depicted in Rome's founding episodes are instead strongly marked as individual actors who work best alone.[5] Although they begin as one of two men who have been chosen as leaders, sharing power does not work. Instead, the ideal harmony between the two leaders is consistently set up for failure. This is particularly the case when the two men are in a position of supreme power at the head of the Roman state. I call the portrayal of such men in Roman historical writing 'dyadic rivalry', and will define this term more precisely below.[6]

In the chapters that follow, I explore the use of these dyadic rivals as a means of problematizing shared power, aristocratic virtue, and the rewards granted to individual predominance. I argue that these concerns are visible in the various retellings of Roman legends, and that such accounts are reinterpreted under the influence of changing socio-political situations. This development continues over the course of the second and first centuries BCE in a variety of media. Stories from later eras show less certainty about the potential benefits of grants of unusual authority, reaching a nadir around the assassination of Caesar; such uncertainty is marked by the ambiguous or negative portrayal of the protagonists. Dyadic rivalry establishes a discursive situation in which new leaders, such as Augustus, can be fit into the narration of the traditional past. But the preoccupations of these tales were ultimately Republican, as is shown by their virtual disappearance after the Augustan era. This is not an accident, nor proof that Livy was superior to his predecessors. Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* marked the end of a tradition of historical writing on the origins of the city. As I will argue, that tradition was intimately concerned with problematizing, justifying, and exemplifying the virtues of collegiality. With the establishment of the Principate, shared power ceded to individual predominance.

3 Livy 6.6.6–17.

4 This is perhaps more likely in earlier historical episodes than more recent ones; however, for the Roman tendency to see a repetitive cycle among past and present actors within the same family, see Richardson 2012.

5 Farrell 2013:57 considers this theme "of the exceptional individual, the *unus homo* who was so necessary to the success of the state and at the same time such a threat to its communitarian ethos," central to Republican history.

6 See pp. 14–18.

Doubling in Rome

The idea that twosomes or doubling is central to the Roman mentality is not new, and has been studied extensively in modern scholarship. The most obvious examples lie in Romans' choices in constructing their political system: two consuls function as the political heads of state; affairs are categorized as *domi militiaeque*; society itself is divided either between *senatus populusque* or between patricians and plebeians. But doubling is hardly confined to the political sphere. The phenomenon is widespread, particularly in the early history of Rome, and includes many disparate categories: chronological doubling, like the confusion between Tarquinius Priscus and Tarquinius Superbus;[7] geographical doubling, such as the two locations of the *ficus Ruminalis*;[8] thematic doubling, such as the strong similarities between the stories of Lucretia and Verginia;[9] and actual twins, like Romulus and Remus. Although all of these different types of doubles are important for our understanding of Rome and its historiography, in this work I am concerned only with the last: actual twins.

The importance of twins to the Romans' account of their past has led to numerous explanations of their significance. One potential explanation, dating back to Mommsen, suggested that the twins were an explanation of the double consulship. In this case, the foundation legend is purposefully constructed to mirror a historical situation at the time of its writing. That it did not subsequently disappear with the Principate is testament to both the strength of the tradition and the permanence of written records.[10] A second possibility is that the numerous twins in Roman legend are due to Rome's originally 'mixed' character. The city's different Sabine and Latin foundation stories were then condensed into a single, doubled tale.[11]

Perhaps most famously, Wiseman has postulated that the twins Romulus and Remus, at least, symbolized the divide between patricians and plebeians. He also outlined a chronology of the tale's development.[12] This development is largely based in the fourth and third centuries, and thus forms a potential

7 For example, both of them were responsible for the building of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; see Livy 38.7 and 1.55.1–56.1; DH 3.69 and 4.61. See also e.g. Poucet 1985:204 and 239 (see also *id.* 2000:155–6); Ogilvie 1976:81 for doubling of Greek events in Roman history.

8 See e.g. Evans 1991, with full citation of the ancient sources.

9 See e.g. Kraus 1991; Freund 2008.

10 E.g., Mommsen 1881; Rawson 1991:252; *contra*, Carandini 2006:269 (cf. pp. 301–2).

11 E.g., Cornell 1995:74–6; Grandazzi 1997:168–9; Coarelli 2003:48; Wiseman 2004:143–4; Forsythe 2005:96.

12 Wiseman 1995a:110–6; see also Mastrocinque 1993:150–1.

background to the developments seen here; some of his arguments, such as the association of Remus with slowness, recur in my analysis. Finally, there have been several universalizing explanations about the general power of twins.[13] These are not specific to Rome, but they have been applied to the case of Romulus and Remus in particular.

In such work on doubling, 'twin' is a broad descriptive category and goes beyond biological twinship. Romulus and Remus, who are twins in the narrow sense (i.e., born to the same mother at the same time) are grouped together with other characters who are not. Their ancestors Amulius and Numitor, for example, are simply brothers. This categorization is perhaps suggested by Livy's choice to emphasize the parallelism between Amulius and Numitor and Romulus and Remus. Other instances where twinship is imposed are less easy to explain; for example, the Lares and the eponymous ancestors of the Potitii and the Pinarii have also been called twins,[14] as have the two Tulliae (the daughters of Servius Tullius),[15] and even the Etruscan Vibennae.[16] We have little information about these characters, and calling them 'twins' presumes a close relationship that they may not share. The argument for twinship as a major theme of Roman, and indeed even Italian, legend has been put forward most forcefully and frequently by Andrea Carandini, who argues that it is impossible to "sottilizzare fra amici, fratellastri, fratelli e gemelli" and that therefore they should all be considered part of the same category of doubles.[17] Carandini's work is prolific and provocative, and his perspective has been influential. But such blurring of boundaries ultimately makes the twin-brother-friend category meaningless.

The Romulus and Remus tale forms the backbone of my study, and ought to be discussed in slightly more detail. Previous analyses of the twins' relationship have tended to focus on the death of Remus. This is understandable; it is unusual for a founding twin (or indeed any mythological twin) to die. Francesca Mencacci has called the Roman foundation story "assolutamente

---

13 E.g., Lincoln 1975 and Puhvel 1975 tie the Roman twins into a larger Indo-European paradigm; Bremmer 1987a suggests that twins are unusual and special; Fraschetti 2005 (explicitly on p. 9; political explanation rejected on p. 5) and Carandini 2006:263–9 argue that the twins signify a primal opposition between nature and culture; Konstan 1986 suggests that numerous examples of doubling signify "the tension between native and foreign" and "the problem of reconciling stability and expansion" at Rome (p. 215).

14 Mastrocinque 1993:189. See Fabre-Serris 2013:95–6 for an intriguing argument that Vergil's Potitii and Pinarii serve as a model for Ovid's Romulus and Remus narrative in the *Fasti*.

15 Thomas 2006:198n80.

16 E.g., De Grummond 2006:174.

17 Carandini 2006:379; cf. pp. 51–4. See also, e.g., Carandini 1997a:56–8, 160–2.

isolate" for this very reason.[18] Modern scholarship has come up with a variety of solutions. One is to seek parallels in other myths in which heroes ultimately murder someone for the benefit of their society.[19] Other interpretations have tried to incorporate the Romans' distress at Remus' demise by setting the story squarely in its Roman context, reasoning that the story must have had relevance in Rome in order to survive. Because Remus dies while jumping across the city's walls, it has been considered a warning against wall violation.[20] This is plausible in itself, but does not explain fratricide. A suggestion that does explain the fratricide is to see the story as a legitimating mechanism for Romulus, whose superiority as founder is confirmed by Remus' death.[21]

Mythographic models have offered a way to understand the twins that is not based around the death of Remus. These include Bianchian dualism,[22] Dumézilian trifunctionality, and Girardian doubles. Ugo Bianchi's notion of dualism has polar opposition as its basic premise. Bianchi categorized these oppositions into various types, based on stories from various cultures across the globe.[23] This approach can be criticized as schematic and does not account well for nuances within a mythological tradition; moreover, it was designed for creation myths, rather than foundation legends. The oppositions drawn are between urban and rural lifestyles, but this explanation does not account for the continuing relevance of the twins' story in Rome.

Georges Dumézil's theory of three functions is based on a broad sample of Indo-European mythology. It postulates a triad of deities, each with a crucial

18 Mencacci 1996:194.

19 E.g., Cornell 1995, citing Cyrus the Great and Moses; this suggestion had previously been ruled out by Bremmer 1987a:27. See also Roller 1996 for Romulus and Remus as Greek twins; Morgan 1998:186 for Remus as a sacrifice. Cornell's claim is problematic: neither Cyrus nor Moses kills a relative (much less his own twin brother), but rather antagonistic figures. Therefore, the murders that they perpetrate are not a source of confusion or shame for their descendants. Some Romans, on the other hand, were troubled by the death of Remus.

20 Bremmer 1987a:36–37.

21 Miles 1995:148; Meurant 2000.

22 E.g., Carandini 2006:26, the use of twins "è una creazione miticamenta/narrativamente necessaria, perfino ovvio nell'universo mitico dei Latini, saturo di gemelli pacifici ma che conosce anche fraterni di cui uno finisce male." He gives a list of these brothers: "Fauno e Latino, Ascanio e Silvio, Amulio e Numitore, Remo e Romolo, Celio e Aulo Vibenna e (forse anche) Mastarna/Servio Tullio e Gneo Tarquinio (della Tomba François a Vulci), se Servio è un bastardo di Tarquinio, come sospettava Cicerone." See also Mastrocinque 1993:188–9. Schilling 1979 is also dualistic, though not eschatological.

23 A very basic introduction in Bianchi 2010:47–9; the more detailed argument is made in Bianchi 1983.

function to early agricultural life: the first function is the priest-king; the second, the warrior; and the last, the farmer or agricultural deity. Dumézil himself suggested that Romulus embodies the third function (agriculture), although the existence of Remus was admittedly a thorny problem.[24] His popular theories have subsequently been expanded to include more figures from Roman tradition; most recently, a fourth function has been added.[25] Dumézil's own hesitation in this regard is best followed.

Finally, the twins have been connected with René Girard's mimetic doubles.[26] This theory is somewhat complicated. It begins with the idea that desires are intangible: in particular, they are formed by one person (person A) seeing the successful possession of a quality or item by another person (person B). Person B then becomes the focus of desire, in the sense that Person A wants to be Person B; to Person A, Person B is a fully realized version of himself. Concurrently, Person B feels the same emotions as Person A. This relationship of mirrored desire becomes rivalry, with both A and B attempting to fulfill their desires through replacing the other. This relationship can only be resolved by violence, often seen as a primordial sacrifice, which eliminates the tension between the two rivals by allowing either A or B to become the fully realized AB, a process that is in many ways similar to Hegelian dialectic. The theory of mimetic desire in its application to Romulus and Remus suffers from its schematism. In order for the twins to be mimetic doubles, Romulus must at least order the death of Remus, if not kill him. Yet this role of Romulus in Remus' death is frequently left ambiguous by Roman authors; as a result, the story does not always fit the paradigm. Nonetheless, many aspects of this explanation are attractive.

There have also been numerous political explanations of the myth. In the majority of these explanations, the fratricide provides an aetiological model for some aspect of Roman governance. Some have argued that the story of the twins justifies the merits of Republican government over monarchy. The fratricide is supposed to be troubling to the Romans, for Romulus' bad qualities are part of what makes the shared rule of the Republic so compelling.[27] Another

24 Dumézil 1996:151; the theory of trifunctionality in ancient Rome is laid out on pp. 148–75.

25 Alain Meurant argues that Romulus and Remus *each* represent a function, with the result that by the end of his life, Romulus embodies all three Dumézilian functions at the same time. See Meurant 2000:91–5 and 2003a; similarly, Tiffou 1976:999. Four functions: see Sauzeau and Sauzeau 2012.

26 E.g., Johner 2003; cf. Thomas 2006:8–15. Both stress the *avitum malum* of the twins as essential to this interpretation.

27 Classen 1963:455–7. The earlier part of his paper, on the local and unified nature of the Romulus and Remus tale, is less important for my argument.

option is that each twin represents a civic group: Romulus the patricians and Remus the plebeians. The death of Remus can then be understood as an elite attempt to deny or subjugate external authority.[28] This explanation can also be connected to other stories of killing for Rome's benefit, such as the execution of the first consul Brutus' sons.[29]

Finally, two fairly recent works on the twins offer quite different approaches and conclusions. Wiseman argued for a strong association of the foundation legend with Roman political culture. He suggested that the creation of the twins' story can be directly linked to the foundation of the shared consulship as a political system. Wiseman dates the creation of the twins and the consulship to 367 BCE; as a result, the twins cannot be seen as Rome's founders until the late fourth century. This dating puts them very close in time to our first pictorial evidence for Romulus and Remus (coins and the now lost statue of the Ogulnii), although it requires him to dismiss the admittedly ambiguous evidence of a fourth-century Praenestine mirror.[30] His goal is to explain Remus' death: as he states, "*any* reason for the existence of Remus is bound to be inconsistent with a need to kill him off."[31] But this is simply not true; as I demonstrate below, the death of a dyadic rival is an integral part of Roman legend, and as a result, Remus exists for the sole purpose of eventually being murdered. This interpretation also has the benefit of answering the most common criticism of Wiseman's argument: that the changes he postulates happen too quickly and are too great to be credible.[32]

Nonetheless, Wiseman's argument has been influential. Many of his conclusions are convincing, and others, such as the idea that the tale originally

---

28 Mastrocinque 1988:124; the main thrust of his argument is about the Tarquin household rather than the twins. For the idea of the twins representing the patricians and the plebeians, see also Dulière 1979:53 and Wiseman 1995a.

29 Rea 2007:41 locates the story strongly in first-century politics: the story is "a warning against those who wished for divisive political factions" and "represented the sacrifices that Rome had to make in order to survive." Similarly, Bannon 1997:158–73 and ver Eecke 2008:210–22 argue that the death of Remus is an indication of *stasis* that relates directly to the civil wars. Armstrong 2013 considers the strife between Romulus and Remus to mark the end of their fraternity.

30 Wiseman 1995a:65–71. He identifies the figures on the mirror as the Lares (cf. also Wiseman 1993, 1995b (=2008b), and 1997), an idea that has been hotly contested; see e.g. Carandini 1997b. For the statue and coins, see below, pp. 120–22.

31 Wiseman 1995a:117.

32 To this end, see the argument in Wiseman 1995a:138–150 in particular. For criticism, see e.g. Fraschetti 2005:7 (it requires late and radical changes to mythological narrative that seem unlikely in the absence of autocracy); Beard 2013:66–9 (ingenious, but requires dismissing too much evidence).

masked a human sacrifice that the Romans made in the throes of the third Samnite War, are problematic but provocative.[33] But he is primarily concerned with the origins of this tale. His use of evidence from an extremely long period of time, from Ennius in the second century BCE to the chronicles of the sixth century CE, allows for the presentation of a consistent vision of the twins' narrative, despite changes in historical parallels. The importance of Wiseman's work is undeniable; however, emphasis on the various nuances in different accounts of Romulus and Remus yields somewhat different conclusions.

Ver Eecke's extensive study of the Romulus legend is similarly structured, although focused on the more successful twin.[34] She examines in meticulous detail every known account of the Romulus legend and argues that the tale reflects two main changes in Rome: the expansion from city-state to empire and the political development from Republic to Principate. Despite her use of source material from as late as the Byzantine period, her argument is primarily focused in the late Republic; this is due to the central place of the twins' tale in the source material of this period. She connects all Romulus stories to Roman political thought, and in particular to the supposed factionalism of first-century politics. Her main claim is that the Sullan era saw Romulus develop into a tyrant, a characterization that had been largely absent in his previous depictions. Although I agree that the tyrannical Romulus is a later development, my analysis of the relevant sources shows it appearing still later; sources from the 80s and 70s are so fragmentary that it seems dangerous to attribute change directly to the events of this period. Indeed, as I argue in chapter three, the evidence of the 60s does not yet reveal a tyrannical Romulus.

Although both Wiseman and ver Eecke aim to elucidate why authors made the choices they did, at least to a certain degree, they use their evidence out of strict chronology: late evidence is used make a point about an earlier period (often one for which we lack contemporary evidence). Their work is not anachronistic per se; they do not, for example, apply the conditions of Byzantine Greece to second-century Rome. But they also fail to address the potential

---

33 Wiseman 1995a:125, "these descriptions surely presuppose the notion of a foundation sacrifice. Most versions, however, turn the story of Remus' death into an exemplary tale. . . . Like Brutus with his sons, so Romulus refuses to put even a brother's life before the safety of the city. That, I suggest, is an edifying reinterpretation . . . It seems to me most likely that Propertius [3.9.50] and Florus [1.1.8] preserve the original version of the story of the death of Remus, created as a legendary analogue to the horrifying necessities of 296 BC [i.e., human sacrifice], and that the most usual account was the result of the passing of the crisis." For human sacrifice, see further below, p. 154n40.

34 ver Eecke 2008; her argument continues Romulus' story into his apotheosis. As I am interested in Romulus' relationships with others, rather than his biography per se, I do not examine his death in great detail.

changes introduced into these narratives by later compilers. The temporal limits I have placed on my study are unique in the investigation of these stories, and are aimed at isolating more specifically the exact discourses in place in the last two centuries BCE.

Through this summary, I hope to have shown that none of the above analyses can adequately explain why this story fascinated Romans of the first century. Most explanations of Roman twinship and doubling are tied to the twin founders of the city, Romulus and Remus, because this legend provides our fullest surviving accounts of Roman twins. This too creates difficulties, because no other twin in Roman legend dies. It is inconsistent to make an argument about "twins" based on the criterion of biological kinship (and sometimes an expanded definition) and to use Romulus and Remus as a pattern for this twin relationship, yet to continually insist that Romulus and Remus are unique. If they are unique, they cannot be accurate models. My approach improves upon this methodology by stressing narrative similarities in the texts I discuss.

Fratricide is not the focal point of the Romulus and Remus tale. Killing a family member was not necessarily a crime in Roman legend, and other narrative accounts of such a murder for the good of the city did not give Romans pause.[35] Although we do not have evidence that the law was used in the historical period, the *paterfamilias* legally had the right to kill his adult offspring; in some cases, the *paterfamilias* would have been an older brother. In a similar incident from Roman legend, when Horatius kills his sister Horatia for mourning the Curiatii, he is acquitted.[36] Instead, the key theme of the Romulus and Remus tale centers on their changing relationship to one another. Such relationships are the focus of my argument here.

Methodologies

The main aim of this study is to propose a new category through which we can filter the vast amount of evidence we have for a particular subgroup of Roman

35 E.g., Brutus' execution of his sons, discussed in chapter six, or Manlius Torquatus' murder of his son for insubordination. See Gaughan 2010 for an extensive discussion of rightful murder in the regal period and Republic; Dougherty 1993 for the productive aspects of pollution in the context of Greek foundation legends.

36 Horatius is certainly not the *paterfamilias* (his father speaks at his trial), which further suggests that fratricide was not an insoluble problem for the Romans. Romulus probably was not *paterfamilias*, either; the twins' birth order was unknown, which is why they turned to augury to resolve the foundation of the city. For the possibility that Romulus was initially Remus' son, see Mencacci 1996:177n10.

legends. What I call 'dyadic rivalry' is a narrative pattern that was used in discourses surrounding founding figures of the city. Such stories offered a way for writers to think about and represent the changing power dynamics in the city, addressing topics ranging from aristocratic competition to personal power, and the appropriate limits of each in the Roman state. Dyadic rivals offer a safe way to discuss potentially sensitive political issues: the characters are mythical or legendary, and contemporary parallels are intentionally obscure. Much as with the case of ancient art, in which the viewer seeing a genre scene must 'fill in' the details of a particular story, dyadic rivals suggest vague parallels to recent events without commitment. It is too strong to say that such stories directly reflect a given situation; the surviving variants do, however, indicate authorial responses to contemporary stimuli. My governing assumption is that we do not possess all of the variants of these tales that could be and were told; therefore, the inclusion or exclusion of any given variant in an author is a deliberate choice, and that choice is related to the author's overall goals for his work.

My approach is, broadly speaking, cultural. I am interested in exploring why individual Romans chose to relate a particular version of their past at a particular time. In that sense, I examine the social context of these stories' production. My sources are primarily literary, as the written accounts of early Rome provide the bulk of the material; however, when the evidence allows, I also analyze visual material. The producers of all our sources made choices about what stories they would present in their works, and such choices must not be separated from their social, political, and cultural milieux. My analysis of the ways in which Roman writers discussed the stories of the founding figures of the city suggests that these narratives of dyadic rivalry establish a nexus of elite competition, political ambition, and social norms that is increasingly seen as problematic over the course of the last two centuries BCE.

My focus on individual narratives to make a broader statement of social relevance is admittedly imperfect. In most cases, multiple contemporary works have not survived to ensure that the connections I make are applicable to society at large. All of the works I examine, though—with the possible exception of Cicero's letters—were intended for a broad audience of social peers and superiors (and occasionally even people lower on the social scale). This audience ensures that complete outliers are unlikely to have gained acceptance or survived. I see these authors as forming pieces of a rich memory tradition that found its focus in the wealthier members of society.[37] I refer to these upper

---

37 See e.g. Buker 1987:2–6; Flower 2003; Walter 2004:408–26.

strata as 'elite', although they are frequently not the political elite of Rome; in this book, 'elite' means simply a broadly-defined leisure class, while 'political elite' refers to the the men whose deeds drove government processes at Rome.

The pervasiveness of any political ideas among the Roman elite deserves a brief comment. As outsiders of high social standing were encouraged to attempt to join a higher social stratum, they are likely to have had at least enough knowledge to emulate, perpetuate, and comment upon the behavior of the political elite as well. The responses and attitudes of the readers and viewers of these works are more difficult to gauge, and my analysis is centered on the suggestiveness of works like Livy's, Ovid's, or Dionysius', and their openness to multiple and complex readings.[38]

Cultural approaches can be criticized for drawing broad conclusions from individual creators (whether of literary or material works). My argument is equally open to this criticism. My analysis is based on the assumption that our surviving authors were aware of the social values held by their peers, and that their works promote, question, or challenge these values. As such, their 'message' may be individual, but it must harmonize with the times. This evidence can then be placed within the wider frame of cultural memory. This model suggests that a community constructs its (in this case, distant) past in a manner that is acceptable within a given socio-cultural context.[39] This account of the past is mutable and can be re-interpreted over time as the needs of the culture require. In this sense, *monumenta* offer the Roman writer a skeleton of names and extremely basic events that could then be fleshed out in a manner that fit his own aims.

Because dyadic rivals problematize shared power, they are most relevant to citizens with a significant stake in political affairs; while I would not exclude the possibility that lower-status Romans told different stories about the same characters, I have not sought them out for analysis. As a result, although I am

38 In this sense, it is close to the suggestions for reading Roman ritual in Ovid put forward by e.g. Beard 1987:7–8 and Phillips 1992:69. See similarly Roller 2004 and Langlands 2011 on the importance of context; also the excellent formulation of Baraz 2012:3, "it is the peculiar nature of the *mos maiorum* that it is only the *exempla* that are stable; no overall conceptual framework restricts their interpretation," thus allowing for polyvalence.

39 See e.g. Gowing 2005, especially pp. 10–12 and 18–24; Hölkeskamp 2005:249–53. Walter 2004:11–41 discusses memory in its Roman context in great depth, and handles the monuments in early Rome on pp. 155–82. Roller 2013 offers an excellent analysis of Augustus' reuse of and competition with earlier monuments. The collected papers in Farrell and Nelis 2013 examine Augustan poetry from a memory perspective.

concerned with the issue of political power, this book is not well-positioned to offer a contribution to the burgeoning debate on the role of the people in Roman Republican governance.[40]

Dyadic Rivals

Dyadic rivalry is a term borrowed from political science. In that discipline, it refers to external relations, in particular military conflicts, between two usually equal powers. Yet these same nations can reap great benefits from cooperation. This is true not only because of the increases in economic and socio-political security that often accrue at a time of peace, but also because the same areas that lead to conflict, when equitably shared, yield productive benefits to both nations. I have repurposed this term to fit a smaller scale: rather than interstate rivalries, I examine rivalry between individual Romans, particularly legendary founders. The resources for which they compete are political authority and office, and personal reputation. I define the object of these struggles as clashes between ambition (to achieve more than one's family and peers) and tradition (of collegial governance), or between competition (for political office and glory) and cooperation (as the ideal form of government). To a large degree, I consider these two conflicts to be mutually dependent: the ideal aim is to achieve the greatest renown within the existing political system.

In analyzing these founding figures, I emphasize a single pattern in their stories. This pattern is the basis for my definition of dyadic rivals: two closely connected characters in a single story who initially seem to share a single function and cooperate towards the same ends. At a later point in the story, however, they cease to act as allies and instead become rivals or are put in opposition to one another, ultimately leading to the death or disappearance of one of them. One of the most characteristic features of their relationship is that one of the two is marginalized: although he plays an important role in the story at the start, he never completely fulfills this initial promise. His importance quickly diminishes, and his function changes from an active character to an unnecessary one. There are several twosomes in Roman history who lack this characteristic feature; they are not dyadic rivals, despite other similarities.

Focusing on dyadic rivals clarifies the terminology of Roman legend. As I indicated above, modern scholarship has tended to focus on the 'twin', including under that label several figures who were not twins; sometimes the same figures are called 'doubles', even if their characters or actions are not the same.

40 For which see, e.g., Millar 1984a; Jehne 2003; Morstein-Marx 2004.

This usage can be confusing. Dyadic rivals under my definition avoid this problem. Unlike the static state of twinship or brotherhood, dyadic rivalry is based on the active and changing relationship between characters. Although the two men at the center of the narrative may be related biologically, they need not be; they are always related thematically. As a result, if the constituents of a dyadic rival relationship are referred to as "twins", this will be additional information, not *variatio*. Furthermore, some individuals who are often seen as 'doubles' or 'twins' are not dyadic rivals. There are a number of different reasons for this: we may not know enough about them, they may never come into conflict, or they may be temporally distinct.[41] For such figures, doubling or twinship may provide a better means of analysis and comparison with similar characters.

An excellent example of the distinction between twins and dyadic rivals is the difference in the Roman treatments of Romulus and Remus on the one hand, and of Hercules and his twin, Iphicles, on the other. Both sets are composed of biological twins, but while the twin founders Romulus and Remus form a relationship of dyadic rivalry, the twins Hercules and Iphicles do not. This is because Romulus and Remus, at least in narratives of their early life, often act together: for example, although they are physically separated at the fight to regain the throne of Alba Longa for Numitor, both work towards the same end. In contrast, the fact that Hercules was born a twin is rarely referenced in the Roman tradition, and thus for the most part he acts alone. While some might argue that this is due to the fact that Hercules does not reach Italy until he is an adult, at which point he tends to act without Iphicles even in Greek mythology, this cannot be the entire explanation. It is noteworthy that Iolaus, Hercules' occasional companion in Greece, is also absent from Roman tales about Hercules, and that both Iolaus and Iphicles appear together with Hercules on Etruscan mirrors. Taken together, this implies that the isolation of Hercules from his companion is a particularly Roman theme.

A similar focus can be seen in Roman tales about Castor and Pollux. In Greece, these demigods are the consummate devoted twins.[42] Roman authors certainly knew of this relationship. Yet when the two are introduced into Rome, Castor becomes far more important than his brother. The Forum temple dedicated to them is the temple of Castor (*aedes Castoris*), and the brothers themselves become known as *Castores* rather than Castor and Pollux or even

41 Examples of these are, respectively, the two uncles of Caeculus, the founder of Praeneste (see e.g. Serv. *Aen.* 7.678; Bremmer 1987b); the Dioskouroi (see citations below, n. 43); and the two Tarquins (see citations above, n. 7).

42 For a typology of twin relations, see Mencacci 1996.

the Dioskouroi.[43] Although it is possible that this pattern of rivalry was felt to be appropriate for Roman legendary material only, I do not wish to make that claim. In broad outline, conflict between two former allies is not an unusual theme; the topicality of surviving stories of dyadic rivals is more interesting to me. From this, I suggest that these stories represent one way, though not the only way, for various writers to think about the changing politics of their eras.

I have limited my material in several ways. First, chronologically: I have not examined stories that take place in what I consider the historical period, from roughly the fourth century BCE onwards. This is not because I think that dyadic rivals were necessarily absent from the historical period, but because I wish to allow authors the greatest leeway for innovation. This chronological limit places all of the dyadic rivals in the realm of mythical history, which is to say that no Roman historian is likely to have met anyone who knew the actors involved. The many accounts of the city's origins that were written in the first century, in particular, point to the legendary past as an important cultural touchstone for Roman authors. I have included historical episodes subsequent to 390 as comparanda; as even ancient historians express doubts about any information prior to the Gallic sack, I consider this period to be one of legend.[44]

In addition, this restriction limits (although it cannot eliminate) favoritism in the narratives themselves: the authors in question are not connected to the descendants of many of these characters. It also allows for ample restructuring by the writers. Such rewriting is apparent from the numerous extant versions of almost every pair of dyadic rivals discussed; these are stories that Romans chose 'to think with'. This phrase, originating from Claude Lévi-Strauss, has become instrumental in modern attempts to understand Romans' use of their mythology.[45] To judge by Cicero, contemporary Romans separated mythological material from remembered history, particularly in terms of its knowability and presumptive truth value. The early past was less knowable and therefore more malleable.[46] It should be noted that I do not distinguish between the

43 The Dioskouroi are discussed further in chapter 5; see also Hadszits 1931 and the several volumes of excavation reports published by Poulsen et al. (1994–2009).

44 Livy 2.21.4; 6.1.1–2; 8.40.4–5. Cf. Newlands 1995b:135 and Hardie 2002 for a similar problem of historicity in Ovid's *Fasti*.

45 Well discussed by Beard 1993; see also the contributions of Burkert 1993, Graf 1993, and Hölscher 1993 (in the same volume), the latter particularly valuable for the discussion of myth used to construct a historical past. More concise is the contribution of Scheid 1998:147–9. The papers in Carbonell and Rives 1990, while not aimed at the classical past, nonetheless make some useful points.

46 See e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 1.4–5, with Dyck 2004 *ad loc.*; Dyck's commentary supplies many additional citations from both Greek and Roman authors. See also Richardson 2012 for a contrasting perspective.

categories of 'myth' and 'legend' in this regard; I follow those who argue that this largely unhelpful distinction was created for modern folklore, was not observed by Romans themselves, and tends to denigrate Roman stories in comparison to Greek.[47] My argument indeed does the opposite, and reinforces the argument for both the creativity of Roman mythographic activity and the Romans' active adaptation of imported culture.

The second limit is spatial. I have not looked at events outside of central Italy in examining dyadic rivalry, which is primarily a function of the first restriction. That does require that much of the early history of Aeneas, as told by Roman writers, has been left out of consideration; I do, however, address recent work on the death of Turnus which argues that he is Aeneas' 'double'. Similarly, I do not discuss Roman retellings of Greek myths or their histories of other areas. As I have argued, such accounts are less likely to include dyadic rivalry anyway. I have also excluded a number of 'native Italian' doubles because we have so little information about them.[48]

In general, then, I have focused on the legendary history of early Rome, as relayed through narratives that are fairly well-documented. The core of my analysis is the Romulus and Remus saga, because it is amply discussed by numerous authors of the period. Nonetheless, my argument requires more than one set of rivals; Romulus and Remus are far from unique. I have tried to set the accounts in question in a particular dated context, although uncertainties about various dates of composition mean that some conclusions remain provisional.

Dyadic rivalry is one way, but certainly not the only way, that Roman authors conceived of power relations at Rome, and particularly the status of men who played a foundational role in the city's history. By this I mean that such stories provide a set narrative paradigm, similar to Jacques Poucet's idea of *motifs classés*, and thus changes to details can alert us to an author's concerns.[49] These stories change over time, and their shifting emphases allow us to glimpse changing attitudes on the part of the Roman elite. In particular, as we will see, dyadic rivalry is closely engaged with the issues of kingship and

---

47 For myth's special status in relation to other types of folklore, see e.g. Burkert 1987:10, admitting that myth cannot be defined. On the issue of Roman vs. Greek myth, see e.g. Burkert 1993 (with extensive bibliography), Graf 1993, and Beard 1993; Calame 1999:122 has argued that "in spite of its Hellenic name, myth is not an indigenous category" even in Greece, nor is there "a notion approximate to the modern category of myth"; instead, we must "recognize myth as a notion of modern Western anthropological thought" (p. 121).

48 There is no standard list of these twins, but many are discussed in Carandini 1997.

49 Poucet has frequently defined these terms; see e.g. Poucet 1985:238–43. Hölscher 1993:71–7 argues that a similar situation held for art.

oligarchy. These associations do not necessarily hold for twins, nor of other types of doubles, whose narratives may differ widely. Nonetheless, I acknowledge that other possible ways to illustrate tension between two individuals besides dyadic rivalry existed, and these various discourses could complement or challenge each other. I will return to this notion briefly at the end.

Situating the Problem

The ideal of collegiality was at odds with elite ideology, which emphasized the importance of equalling, if not surpassing, the great deeds of one's forebears and peers.[50] This interplay of competition and unity has been noted before; Fergus Millar notably drew attention to the need to restrain by constitutional means the theoretically regal power of Roman generals in the second century.[51] As Nathan Rosenstein has argued in regard to Roman military command,

> Aristocratic competition lay at the heart of the Roman Republic… Contention among the ruling elite for glory and renown, for public offices, and for the honor, rank, and authority that attended them regulated Rome's markets and built its roads, saw to the worship of the gods, crafted laws, led the city's armies and conducted its foreign affairs. These struggles were vital to the success of the res publica. Yet what aristocratic competition could serve it could also subvert. The pursuit of success at any cost or in any manner or even at the wrong moment could bring aristocratic ambition into conflict with the vital interests of the Republic.[52]

A similar argument has been made by Tanya Itgenshorst about the triumph, and by Tonio Hölscher about monuments.[53] Such competition thus found its way into all aspects of elite life.

My argument draws this rivalry into the sphere of legendary historiography. This interaction yields a productive tension that is visible in Roman mythmaking. The stories I examine are all about leading men in the state who initially work closely with a colleague on a project vital to Rome's continuing prosperity.

---

50 See e.g. Rosenstein 1990:6–9; Fantham 2003:9; Hölscher 2004a.

51 Millar 1984a:3, "of course this 'monarchic' power was confined in time and space and restricted by the processes of the Roman constitution."

52 Rosenstein 1993:313, with a very full bibliography.

53 Itgenshorst 2004; Hölscher 2004a. Amy Richlin has pointed out to me that the holding of games (among other activities) falls into the same competitive sphere.

Yet this goal can only be accomplished by the elimination of one rival; the collegiality that is at the heart of the Republican system is broken. At the same time, the hero of the tale is praised for being a founder or savior and retains extraordinary influence over later events.

The model of dyadic rivalry implicitly questions the value of shared power, and thus illuminates the problems and tension inherent in this ideal at Rome. Roman aristocrats were ambitious and encouraged to excel, a value that sometimes conflicted with the compromises necessary for sharing power. This is an odd lesson for a state whose government centered around the chief command of two individuals, ideally balanced by a council of statesmen. But in fact, it is this very system of government that makes sense of the dyadic rival tradition. The ambition that was encouraged in young men of the elite was in many ways fundamentally at odds with the notion of shared power. The good of friends or family and the good of the state did not always intersect, resulting in difficult choices. Legendary history offered models for potential ways to navigate a clash. Various moral values could be assigned to these actions; the majority of the figures I examine are morally ambiguous, leaving the judgment of right and wrong to the reader's discretion.

Although the desire to excel was always supposed to work in the service of the Republic, it could easily clash with the ideal of collegiality. Tales of dyadic rivalry, perhaps an outgrowth of this tension, do not provide solutions, but instead provide a means of addressing the problem in a form that was both more concrete than political theory and yet distanced from contemporary political finger-pointing. In the second century, I suggest, concern about the limits of collegiality and ambition could be resolved through the notion of productive competition. By the first century, however, the evidence indicates that stories of individual predominance seemed more accurate than aristocratic squabbling. This situation in turn allowed later writers to use the same myths to explain civil conflict. With the establishment of Augustus as a guide for the state, these tensions become less relevant; although the Republican tradition of two consuls endured, the *princeps* acted as an arbiter of potential conflict. The stories are less common in writers of the Principate, and reappear only with the renewed sharing of power in late antiquity.

Sources and Historicity

The Roman narratives that I will be addressing here represent attempts at elite self-definition and self-representation to an audience that the writers understood would include not only their contemporaries and peers, but also later

generations and those outside of their social group. As such, they were broadly didactic; sometimes, as in the cases of Livy and Dionysius, explicitly so.[54]

Ancient historians tended to view past actors as motivated by the same forces as contemporary ones. They thus projected their own concerns, fears, and insecurities into their accounts of their own history: each generation remodeled its history according to its own concerns.[55] My own interest lies in the use of Roman legend to address changes in the last centuries of the Republic's existence. The various retellings of these legends reveal an increasingly tense relationship between the aristocratic quest for *gloria* on behalf of the state and the possibility of an individual acquiring too much political power. Although the different stories of dyadic rivalry highlight various concerns, all center around the problem of elite perceptions of political power.

Like many others, I consider the relationship between reader and writer to be instrumental in the creation of social discourse and cultural memory. The exchange of ideas by means of the legendary past offered Roman elites a vast field for the creation and assertion of their identity. In some cases, the stories I examine may be attempting to construct exemplary behavior for the city's political actors. Such an attempt is particularly likely to come from a writer whose social status was high, but not among the highest in Rome. In this case, the work's delineation of cultural values could prove the writer's right to enter the social tier to which he aspired. In other cases, a writer might choose to glorify a member of the political elite as a patron.

The views put forward by these authors were not the only views held by the Roman elite, and may not have been representative of the majority or the leading opinion. Our evidence contradicts the idea of a monolithic historical perspective, since we frequently possess multiple contemporary perspectives on a single story. Indeed, each of the stories that I examine survives in at least two significantly different versions. These competing versions highlight the continuing vitality of early history in Rome and support my claim that such history remained relevant for the entire period in question.

The stories I have chosen are related by most authors of the second and first centuries BCE. In the following chapters I analyze isolated texts of Fabius Pictor, Ennius, Naevius, Cassius Hemina, Calpurnius Piso, Cato the Elder, Licinius Macer, Diodorus Siculus, Catullus, Sallust, Cicero, Valerias Antias, Aelius Tubero, Varro, Verrius Flaccus, Horace, Vergil, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, and Pompeius Trogus. The bulk of the material, however, comes from Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. This is only to be expected, as they supply the only

---

54 See e.g. Livy *praef.* 9–12; DH 1.1.2–4.

55 On this process, see e.g. Hölscher 1993:71; Scheid 1993:122; Walter 2004; Richardson 2012.

histories of the period to survive in any degree of completeness. I discuss all of these authors more fully as they appear, with the dates of the works under consideration; when relevent, I note their place of origin as well, although Italy, and particularly the area of Latium, should be a presumed default.

Because I am primarily concerned with changes to the Republic, I have set the death of Augustus as an endpoint to my argument. This means that, unusually, I have not analyzed authors who wrote in later eras. Although Plutarch, Dio, and the anonymous author of the *Origo Gentis Romanae* can be considered important sources for early Roman history, I am concerned with the evolution of a narrative pattern from the Republic to the early Principate. Later writers cannot provide us with an unproblematic understanding of the culture of this earlier period. Just as the writers listed above reinterpreted the past through their own times, so too are later accounts skewed by their authors' own experiences. My goal in examining these legends, then, is not to create a history of these dyadic rivals or of early Rome, but to assess an intellectual and cultural phenomenon of the second and first centuries BCE.

Of these omitted works, I believe only the absence of the *OGR* requires further defense. This work has become a subject of renewed interest lately, and it has been argued by many that it includes authentic antiquarian information from the late Republic and early Principate.[56] I share the reservations of Alan Cameron on this matter,[57] but use of the *OGR* is increasingly difficult to ignore, as collections of Republican historians now routinely feature citations gleaned from its text as genuine examples of Republican historical or antiquarian writing.[58] Scholars now generally agree that the work is not a modern forgery.[59] It is less certain that it accurately replicates Republican narratives. Although the few examples we can cross-check appear to be genuine, the vast majority of the references are not only unverifiable, but are also attributed to writers whose identities are unclear and who may not have even existed; this is particularly true in the several instances where multiple authors are said to have told the same alternate version of a story.[60] This "group citation" is problematic

56 See e.g. Richard 1983 (esp. his introduction, pp. 7–71); Chassignet 1986:xxxix; Horsfall 1987:4; Cornell 1995:58; Sehlmeyer 2004:7–25; Smith 2005; debate as early as Momigliano 1958.

57 See Cameron 2004:328–34.

58 Contrast Peter's *HRF* of 1906, which eschewed the *OGR*. See Chassignet 1996–2004; Santini 1995; Walt 1997; Beck-Walter 2001 [2005] and 2004; and the updated *FRHist* of 2013.

59 See the discussion in *FRHist* I.96–9.

60 See Cameron 2004:95; *contra*, Smith 2005:100–1, although he alludes to the issue in his conclusion (p. 112). More recently, Smith has modified his argument: he now argues that the author of the *OGR* is "at least trying to refer to works he believed he had read, though the accuracy of his citations may be suspect" (Smith 2010:250n7).

even in a work such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*, which is routinely viewed as more reliable than the OGR in terms of accurate source citation.[61] The OGR is a complex work, and its citations should be viewed in the context of its own narrative aims, rather than simply a repository of citations.[62] This makes it more likely that the OGR's author altered or recontextualized his source material to suit his purpose. In this sense, it is quite different from the Byzantine excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, or even late antique commentaries such as Servius, both of which I have used. The latter seem to have aims that are more likely to preserve information, if indirectly, in at least a similar context to the original; the same cannot be said of the OGR.

As a result, I am skeptical about the use of the OGR as a source of evidence for Republican or early imperial Rome.[63] Although I have made use of its citations, I have not made any of them the sole support for any of my arguments; if the evidence from the OGR is excluded, the structure will, I believe, still stand. I have tried to make similar use of Festus, whose abridgement of Verrius Flaccus is not in question, but which may have omitted key details.[64]

There is no longer a standard work on Roman fragmentary historians. Peter's initial collection, *Historiae Romanorum Fragmenta*, has been replaced by various editions: in French, a three-volume set edited by Martine Chassignet; in German, the two-volume set edited by Hans Beck and Uwe Walter; in English, a three-volume set edited by T. J. Cornell, Christopher Smith, Edward Bispham, and John Rich. Collections of individual historical fragments (Cato the Elder, Calpurnius Piso, Licinius Macer, and Cassius Hemina) have also been published.[65] Only Cornell et al. are able to supply a full concordance, although all collections index back to Peter (and, where relevant, Jacoby). I have used their text throughout, while also discussing all crucial variants. Additionally, for ease of reference I have provided a concordance to all cited historical fragments in the relevant footnote.

61 See the discussion of Fabius Pictor *in FRHist* I.15n22 and below, pp. 182–185.

62 For a similar view of Atheneaus, see McClure 2004:37–8.

63 This seems acceptable even to a defender of the text such as Smith, who freely admits that "the possibilities for errors and misunderstanding [in the OGR] … are high" (2005:105). Nonetheless, the citations from the OGR in *FRHist* are frequently printed in boldface, indicating editorial confidence that they contain the gist of the original work.

64 On the relationship of Festus, Flaccus, and Paul (Festus' excerptor), see Strzelecki 1932; the collection of Glinister et al. 2007 (particularly Glinister 2007); *FRHist* I.67–8.

65 Chassignet 1996–2005; Beck-Walter 2001 [2005] and 2004; *FRHist* I–III [2013]; Chassignet 1986; Forsythe 1994; Santini 1995; Walt 1997. Citations of ancient sources, where relevant to the argument, are also in the footnotes.

Plan of the Argument

The mythical history of early Rome offered appropriate and attractive material for Romans to ruminate on their political circumstances. In the following chapters, I investigate, through the lens of dyadic rivals, how Roman authors grappled with the tension between their ideals of shared power and the value placed on individual ambition. The earliest evidence suggests that rivalry could be productive, bringing benefits to the city even when it meant the elimination of one of the Roman elite. Rivalry was a negative force for the state by the civil wars of the first century. Under Augustus, this perception again changes. In Augustus' own self-fashioning, dyadic rivalry is de-emphasized, just as elite ambition is sharply curtailed by the Principate. Such rivalry problematizes the relationship between ideal collegiality and a system that rewarded individual predominance. The interplay between the need to share power and the drive to achieve could produce tangible benefits to the state; by the first century, however, such benefits were undermined by increasingly acrimonious aristocratic squabbling. Dyadic rivalry offered Roman writers a way to think through the antagonistic politics of the current day, as well as a means of tracing the problem back to the earliest days of the city.

Linking the structure of dyadic rivalry with the discourses of elite competition and individual power helps explain why the Romulus story continued to be promoted, despite its potentially negative undertones. As we see in Roman attempts to replicate anti-Roman discourse, the foundation story could be used to tar Rome as a city tainted by fratricide, rape, and savagery.[66] The variance in the stories about the foundation suggests that these negative aspects could have been hidden, if authors had desired. It seems, then, that historical accounts had an interest in maintaining the tension visible in Romulus' biography. This tension is a teaching tool: young Romans learning about their city's history could learn about the appropriate limits of ambition and competitiveness from Romulus' example. The tales of other founders, such as Brutus or Camillus, are similarly edifying, and reinforce the potential dangers inherent in becoming too necessary to Rome. The same drive for glory and praise that led men to excel on the city's behalf could go too far; such ambition had to be checked for the safety of the Republic before it turned to *regnum*.

There are several examples of this tension between individual ambition and shared power, particularly in the mythical period. In the next five chapters, I focus specifically on the founders Romulus and Remus, who offer the greatest scope for examining this narrative development in detail. After laying the

66 Analyzed in detail in e.g. ver Eecke 2008:17–52, with further bibliography.

groundwork with the twins, I expand to other stories of characters who do not fit that categorization: Romulus and Titus Tatius; Amulius and Numitor; Brutus and Collatinus; and finally, Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus. In these narratives, too, I argue for a similar preoccupation with elite competition and executive command. Finally, I address the question of other potential discourses about rulership, and in particular the use of tyranny. This is a discourse that involves, most obviously, Brutus and Manlius; in this chapter I also turn to Cicero's political theory on the potential role of an individual savior in government. I argue that the discourse of dyadic rivalry overlaps with, rather than overpowers, alternative discursive spheres. This overlap creates a richness and complexity in the Roman historiographic tradition.

CHAPTER 2

Birds

At this point, it is time to begin the process of applying the theoretical model that I outlined in the first chapter. The first and primary set of dyadic rivals under examination, Romulus and Remus, justly form one of the most frequently retold sets of stories of the Roman Republic. Analysis of their rivalry occupies over half of this book, which is fitting for their dominance of the literary record.

The history of the twin founders of the city survives in many variants. Greek historians preserve a number of different accounts of the city's foundation, including a variety of founders,[1] while Romans seem to have always recognized a single version (although one whose various retellings differed in many details).[2] This story largely disappears from historical narratives after the late first century BCE, partly due to the authority of Livy and partly because other historical episodes proved more fruitful for imperial Latin writers.[3] This first-century BCE tradition is often called the 'vulgate'; although this term is not particularly apt, it is a useful conceptual tool.[4] It was not until late antiquity that variations on this theme again became popular; these stories can be seen in, for example, the various stories collected in the *OGR*, or John Lydus.[5]

Because of the numerous variants, a brief summary of the ancient evidence may be helpful. The 'vulgate' story of the Roman twins' early life is

---

1 Lists are preserved in the lone surviving Greek historian of the Augustan period, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*AR* 1.72.4–18; all subsequent quotations from Dionysius are from the *AR* unless otherwise specified). See e.g. Gabba 1991:22 for Dionysius' familiarity with Roman historians. On the Greek accounts, see also Classen 1963:447–54, Cornell 1975, and Wiseman 1995a:43–62.

2 The sole exception to this is Festus 326–9L, who offers a variety of different city founders; he also provides a list of earlier Greek authorities.

3 In particular, tales of the Republic; see e.g. Roller 2001, Gowing 2005.

4 E.g., by Marchetti 2002:77 and ver Eecke 2006:76, though the term is widespread. The variance of these stories stands out more clearly to me than their similarities, but it is useful to have a term that encompasses broadly the four major variants known in the first century BCE (outlined below). I cannot agree with Rodriguez-Mayorgas 2010:92 that the variants are irrelevant.

5 See *OGR* 19–22; Lyd. *Mag.* 1.5. Both Wiseman 1995 and ver Eecke 2008 discuss these variants admirably; Bruggisser 1987 is a similarly compelling exposition of the distinctive Romulus tradition of the fourth century.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_004

well-known.[6] Romulus and Remus were the illegitimate children of the Vestal Rhea Silvia (or Ilia),[7] conceived when she was raped by Mars (or a human man).[8] Soon after the twins' birth, they were exposed at the banks of the Tiber by their wicked great-uncle Amulius, who had usurped the throne of Alba Longa from his brother and the twins' grandfather, Numitor. The twins were miraculously saved, however, when a she-wolf suckled them. Subsequently they were found and raised by the shepherd Faustulus.

As young men, Romulus and Remus were the chiefs of the shepherds in their neighborhood and occasionally engaged in bouts of cattle-theft with various other herders from Alba Longa.[9] During one of these encounters, Remus was captured and brought before Numitor; the two formed a plot to overthrow Amulius and regain his throne. At the same time, Romulus back at home learned of his adoption, and with Faustulus and the shepherds helped his brother in the coup at the palace. Amulius was killed and Numitor replaced on the throne. Numitor then sent Romulus and Remus out to found a colony with some of the excess population from Alba Longa, as well as their shepherd companions. Up to this point, the twins had always cooperated. Yet when they went to found the colony, they were suddenly at odds. Despite the fact that they were both sent out as founders, only one of them could actually found the city; despite the excess population, only one city could be founded.

This situation proved difficult to resolve, and so the brothers sought the advice of the gods through augury. From this point forward, variants proliferate. This part of the tale clearly offered the opportunity to put a personal spin on this famous story. In most versions, Romulus prevailed and Remus died. But his death comes about in several distinct ways: Remus is killed in a mob fight that breaks out during the augury context (Livy, Dionysius), or he is killed by

6 The primary first-century sources are Livy 1.3.10–7.3; DH 1.76–88; Cic. *DRP* 2.4–12; Ov. *F.* 2.267–532 (Lupercalia and apotheosis of Romulus), 3.1–166 (rape of Rhea Silvia), 4.807–48 (construction of Rome), and 5.455–90 (death and return of Remus). Sall. *Cat.* 6 is extremely brief; except for Ovid, poetic accounts are more allusive than narrative. See also Fabius Pictor (*FRHist* 1 F4a–c = 7a–c Chassignet = 7a–c B-W = 5a and b P = *FrGrHist* 809 F4a and b and 30b); Licinius Macer (*FRHist* 27 F1 and 2 = 1 and 2 Chassignet = 1 and 2 B-W = 1 P = 1 and 2 Walt); Val. Ant. (*FRHist* 25 F1 and 2 = 1 and 2 Chassignet = 1 and 2 B-W); DS 8.5.

7 This name seems connected to the story that Aeneas was the twins' grandfather; see discussion below, p. 181–3. For Ilia as the daughter of Aeneas, see Ennius *Ann.* 34–50 Sk.; Serv. *Aen.* 1.237 and 6.777.

8 Unnamed by Livy 1.5; her uncle Amulius, according to Licinius Macer and Valerius Antias (Macer *FRHist* 27 F1 and 2 = 1 and 2 Chassignet = 1 and 2 B-W = 1 P = 1 and 2 Walt; Val. Ant. *FRHist* 25 F1 and 2 = 1 and 2 Chassignet = 1 and 2 B-W).

9 See chapter four below and Acilius (*FRHist* 7 F1 = 3 Chassignet = 3 B-W = 2 P = *FrGrHist* 813 F2).

one of Romulus' henchmen (Dionysius, Diodorus, Ovid) or by Romulus himself (Livy, Cicero, Horace). The question of Romulus' agency in Remus' death is a vexed one, and has formed one of the two key areas of inquiry in studying the twins.[10] The other area of inquiry, why two founders were necessary, has been exhaustively researched,[11] and I have little to add here.

Ultimately, though, the death of Remus is only one part of the story of the twins' *relationship*, and it is clear that other frequently-told episodes (such as the Lupercalia) were also crucial pieces of the narrative. Examining cooperative episodes alongside the more negative account of the death of Remus reveals a nuanced account of the foundation, and one that offers a variety of lessons. By approaching the legend through its chronological development, rather than episodically, I argue that the twins' tale is more didactically complex than modern *communis opinio* makes out. Multiple interpretive possibilities are left open for the ancient reader. In the second-century authors Ennius and Hemina, the twins are equals and engaged in competition that benefits the state. The evidence of both Ennius and Hemina is admittedly fragmentary, but it is also close to the only evidence about the twins that remains from this early period.[12] Because I argue that dyadic rivalry was a dynamic part of Republican discourse, the inclusion of such early evidence offers a crucial backdrop and starting point. The institution of productive rivalry that is celebrated in the second-century sources lays a foundation for the innovations in this discourse that appear in the first century, when such rivalry was harmful to the state.

Ennius

Ennius is one of the earliest Latin authors, and his work therefore offers an important glimpse into the stories that were current in the early second century BCE. The *Annales*, his greatest work, at one point covered Roman history

10 See Wiseman 1995a:103–28, with extensive bibliography. It is also important to note that some evidence indicates that Remus perhaps remained alive after the foundation of the city and that the twins' relationship did not deteriorate when they attempted to found the city together (see, e.g., Egnatius *FRHist* 106 F1 [OGR 23.6]; DS 37.11.1, Str. 5.3.2, and Conon *FrGrHist* 26 F1.48. This tradition is discussed further below, p. 171).

11 Discussed above, pp. 5–11.

12 For the problems involved in disentangling Fabius Pictor's account from Dionysius, see pp. 182–185 below. The authenticity of Ennius' poetic account is fairly secure because of its meter; Hemina's is similarly secure because it is cited by Diomedes for grammatical interest.

from Aeneas' arrival in Italy to Ennius' own day. Although the aims of this epic have been debated, with Ennius' debt to his patron at one time considered his most important consideration, the *Annales* soon became the Roman national epic.[13] Ennius himself, although a newcomer to Rome, highlighted virtues that were important to his Roman audience, including men of the highest rank in the city: he was closely connected to Cato the Elder, Scipio Africanus, and most intimately with his long-term patron, Fulvius Nobilior.

The *Annales* was a school text during the Republic, and therefore it can be assumed that the poem had a formative influence on its readers. The impact of the story that Ennius told, then, was both substantial and enduring. In the poem, Ennius makes competitive collegiality a Roman political virtue. This is not to say that he envisioned a Rome without political argument. Indeed, if we judge by the climate of Ennius' own day, such a saccharine picture would have been untenable. Instead, it is more likely that Ennius offered a realistic but sanitized version of aristocratic strife, in which leaders engaged in friendly competition in order to achieve maximal benefit both for themselves and for the state. This message is ultimately conveyed in Ennius' account of the foundation.

Ennius had a recent example of such productive rivalry: the reconciliation of his patron, Fulvius Nobilior, with Aemilius Lepidus.[14] The two had been personal and political enemies, but when both were elected to the censorship of 179, the senate convinced them to resolve their differences. Such reconciliation was particularly crucial in the case of the censorship, which, as Robert Bunse has argued, displayed the most collegiality among all the offices in the Republic.[15] Although this episode does not survive in the fragments of the *Annales*, its treatment in later authors indicates that consensus among leading men was an important part of the story.[16] Fulvius and Aemilius provide

13 See e.g. Skutsch 1968:5–17; Badian 1972:151–62; *CAH*^{2} v. 8 pp. 441–8 [Rawson]; Conte 1994:78–80; Goldberg 1995:112–24 (with bibliography on p. 114n3) and 129–32; Gruen 1996:117–22; Suerbaum 2002:139–42, "die *Annales* das repräsentative Epos Roms republikanische Zeit waren," with references (p. 140). Elliott 2013 problematizes this status somewhat, rightly arguing (with Zetzel 2007) that our Ennius is not the second-century Ennius, but a later conception (see esp. pp. 75–82). Her argument in no way negates the importance of Ennius, nor is that her aim.

14 Cf. Goldberg 1995:116 on the reconciliation of Fulvius Nobilior and Aemilius Lepidus: "Their joint election to the censorship of 179 was … a potential embarrassment to all concerned, but the rivals rose to the occasion." For this censorship, see *MRR* I.362, with further references; ancient sources are given in n. 16 below.

15 Bunse 2001:147.

16 Livy 40.45.1–46.16. Cicero is witness to this story's inclusion in the *Annales* (cf. Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 20–21 = Enn. *Ann.* 16.viii Sk.). It also survives in VM 4.2.1 and Gell. 12.8.5–6;

an illustration of political behavior that Ennius, a relative newcomer to Rome, could absorb and endorse in his own work. The ideals espoused here are that cooperation for the good of the state trumps individual conflict and that two men who shared an office were political equals, even if they differed in wealth, *dignitas*, or another quality.

Livy and Cicero provide similar accounts of this censorship, which suggests that they may both reflect Ennius' narrative. This suggestion is in accord with recent scholarship on the historical nature of the *Annales*.[17] In Livy's version, which is much more detailed than Cicero's, the two men are equal and yet separate. This is clear from the speech of the senator Caecilius Metellus, who says

> singulos cum intuemur, M. Aemili, M. Fulvi, neminem hodie in civitate habemus, quem, si revocemur in suffragium, velimus vobis praelatum esse. ambo cum simul aspicimus, non possumus <non> vereri, ne male comparati sitis, nec tantum rei publicae prosit, quod omnibus nobis egregie placetis, quam, quod alter alteri displicetis, noceat.[18]

This speech establishes the two men as equally matched citizens, whose power and rivalry, if left unchecked, will injure Rome. This is a potentially disastrous situation caused by an imbalance between their desire to benefit the state and their ambition for their individual families. When they act cooperatively, however, their joint tenure of the censorship is extremely productive. This is behavior that could be broadly termed 'ideally Republican'.

It later becomes clear that, while Fulvius and Aemilius are the top men, they are not quite equals.[19] The question of which of the two was in a better position is debatable.[20] Fulvius is in fact a better citizen, a characterization which seems likely to come from Ennius' account. When Livy describes their

---

see Goldberg's (1995) discussion of this issue, as well as Briscoe 2008:528 and Elliott 2013:4–5.

17 See e.g. Gildenhard 2003; Walter 2004:258–63; Elliott 2009.

18 Livy 40.46.3–5, "Aemilius, Fulvius, when we consider you individually, there is no one in the city today whom we would wish to see returned before you, should it come to a vote. But when we consider the two of you together, it is impossible not to fear that you are poorly matched, and that the state will not so much benefit because you please us so greatly as it will be harmed because you displease one another."

19 At least this is true in Cicero (where Aemilius initiates the reconciliation) and Livy (e.g., 40.51.1–6); cf. Skutsch 1985:573 for the equality of the two men in Gellius, a position that fits nicely with my argument for the decreasing importance of the political tension seen in dyadic rivalry during the empire.

20 Cf. Skutsch 1985:572–4; Briscoe 2008:528.

censorial projects,[21] he notes that Aemilius abused his power in two ways: he did not remove all of the senators that Fulvius recommended,[22] and he pursued an unpopular project that was in his own interest.[23] At the same time, his leading status is reaffirmed by the fact that he was chosen *princeps senatus*. Fulvius, on the other hand, carries out projects that are *plura et maioris … usus*.[24] Although the two are colleagues working together, with relatively similar status and prestige, Fulvius is subtly praised for offering greater service to the state. This indicates that two men of high status within the same office did not need to be deemed entirely equal, even when they were cooperating.

The episode as a whole provides important historical context for my argument about dyadic rivalry, as does the similar historical episode of G. Claudius Nero and M. Livius Drusus (Salinator) in the third century.[25] This episode, as well as the next, is known primarily from Livy, but the lessons on display are similar, and it is worth emphasizing the number of these tales. During the war with Hannibal, Claudius Nero is marked out for the consulship because of his talent in warfare; Livius Drusus is chosen as the plebeian consul. The two conduct an effective joint campaign that ends in the death of Hasdrubal. Upon their return, the city is overjoyed; Livy describes how citizens come out to touch the winning generals.[26] Both consuls are allowed to triumph, but not in the same way:

> et supplicatione amborum nomine et triumpho utrique decreto, inter ipsos, ne cum bellum communi animo gessissent triumphum separarent, ita convenit, quoniam et in provincia M. Livi res gesta esset et eo die quo pugnatum foret eius forte auspicium fuisset et exercitus Livianus deductus Romam venisset, Neronis deduci de provincia non potuisset, ut M. Livium quadrigis urbem ineuntem milites sequerentur, C. Claudius

21 Among these projects was the construction of the original Basilica Aemilia (et Fulvia), for which see below, pp. 124–127; the friezes within are unmistakably more recent, but could possibly have featured similar themes to the originals.

22 This was perhaps not truly an abuse of power (it certainly was not by Livy's day); cf. Briscoe 2008:541.

23 Livy 40.51.1–3; the project was earthworks near Aemilius' own property at Tarracina. Livy does not actually censure Aemilius with his own voice, but Aemilius' actions are nonetheless unworthy of censorial ideals. Briscoe 2008:542 calls this "perhaps unwise rather than illegal."

24 Livy 40.51.4, "greater in number and usefulness."

25 See Livy 27.34.3–50.10; Feig Vishnia 1996:80–82; Pittenger 2008:68–72 for this episode, although the entire book is illuminating.

26 Livy 28.9.6–7.

> equo sine militibus inveheretur. ita consociatus triumphus cum utrique, tum magis ei qui quantum merito anteibat tantum honore collegae cesserat, gloriam auxit.[27]

In this case, as in the case of Fulvius Nobilior and Aemilius Lepidus, one of the two consuls is marked out as better, even though both have behaved in an admirably collegial and balanced fashion. Although Nero and Drusus are political equals and the senate recognizes their joint military victory with identical honors, their personal actions and virtues are not the same. This example, too, offers a relatively recent example for Ennius of the appropriate nature of elite competition and cooperation.

One final example indicates the pervasiveness of this ideal Republicanism among the Roman elite of the middle Republic. Fabius Maximus Rullianus and Decius Mus shared multiple offices, including two consulships at Fabius' express desire.[28] Livy begins his description of their second joint consulship by noting that in their previous collaborations, *nec gloria magis rerum, quae ingens erat, quam concordia inter se clari*.[29] But this was not to last. When the senators seek to give Fabius a province by fiat, rather than legally by the lot, Decius protests. The matter is referred to the people, and each consul gives a speech; Fabius, tellingly, claims that he has selected an *adversarium . . . non socium imperii*.[30] Decius, in response, points out that *gloriari Fabium rebus in Etruria gestis: velle et P. Decium gloriari*.[31] This argument is about rivalry on one side, ambition on the other. The people choose the older and more

27 Livy 28.9.9–11, "A supplication was voted to both, and a triumph decreed to each. But because they had conducted the war with a single spirit, they agreed not to separate their triumphs. As the battle had taken place in Livius' province and it had been fought on a day in which he held the auspices and his army had been led away and come back to Rome, while Nero's could not be led out of his province, they agreed that the soldiers would follow Livius as he entered the city in a chariot, while Claudius would arrive on horseback without soldiers. The triumph in this way was agreeably split, and although both increased their their glory, there was more glory for the one who yielded as much honor to his colleague as he himself had additional merit."

28 Livy 10.24.1–2; cf. 10.13.1–14.1.

29 Livy 10.24.2, "the glory of their deeds, which was immense, was not more illustrious than the harmony between them."

30 Livy 10.24.6, "an enemy rather than a companion in command."

31 Livy 10.24.13, "Fabius gloried in his Etruscan deeds; Decius, too, wanted glory." On these wars, see e.g. Salmon 1967, Harris 1971, and Oakley 2005b *ad loc.*; for more historiographical questions on the relations of Fabius and Decius, see Richardson 2012:94–105. Compare, too, Decius as the champion of plebeian rights at 10.7.1–8.12.

experienced Fabius over the plebeian Decius. Livy's account of what happens next is not very clear, but when it is time to fight, Fabius seems to remember Decius' desires. In a speech to the senate, he claims again that he could imagine no colleague in battle other than Decius.[32] Decius graciously accepts, and the people rejoice as if the battle had already been won.

As an aside, Livy adds that some versions of the tale are very different: *invenio apud quosdam extemplo consulatu inito profectos in Etruriam Fabium Deciumque sine ulla mentione sortis provinciarum certaminumque inter collegas quae exposui.*[33] This discrepancy, which intensifies the rivalry between two men whom Livy has previously described as having *uno animo, una mente*,[34] shows the range of possibilities a Roman historian had for interpreting a probably historical episode. Livy's choice is to highlight discord that is overcome; others chose to omit the discord altogether.

The Roman elite was an inherently competitive group, but this competition did not stand in the way of its members perceiving themselves as cooperative and collegial. The intent of maximizing one's own potential for Rome's benefit—even if that required engaging in competition with one's colleague, or cooperation with one's enemy—was key to the Republican ethos as portrayed in these historical examples.

The examples of Fulvius and Aemilius, Claudius and Livius, and Fabius and Decius show that two men with the same office may share power, but subtle differences in status remain (for example, one of the two may be a better citizen, or of higher birth). This slight inequality, though, is not cause for conflict; instead, the two men should try to work collaboratively, setting aside their ambitions and potential disappointments for the greater good of Rome. This sentiment also seems to be reflected in Ennius' treatment of early history; the Ennian narrative of Romulus and Remus shows the twins performing the same task with different results. The strong verbal balance of the twins' description suggests that Ennius treated the twins more equally than the 'vulgate' nar-

---

32 Livy 10.26.2–3, *si sibi adiutorem belli sociumque imperii darent, quonam modo se oblivisci P. Deci consulis per tot collegia experti posse? neminem omnium secum coniungi malle* ("if they would give him an helper in war and colleague in command, how could he forget the consul Decius, experienced through so many shared commands? He preferred no other man to be joined with him").

33 Livy 10.26.5, "I find in some books that Fabius and Decius set out for Etruria immediately at the beginning of their consulship, without any mention of the lots for the provinces or the contestation between colleagues that I have expounded."

34 Livy 10.22.6, "one spirit, one mind." This singularity is largely absent from Livy's preceding narrative. Oakley 2005b:236 calls the emphasis on their friendship "unintentionally ironical", since they are in fact about to fight.

rative. Although Romulus and Remus are engaged in competition, it is a fair competition between two equal (or nearly equal) contestants, similar to the ideal Republicanism we see in the accounts of historical actors.

The Fragment

Ennius' surviving narrative of Romulus and Remus consists almost entirely of the augury contest. The fragment comes from the end of the first book of Cicero's *de Divinatione*; it is part of Quintus Cicero's lengthy exposition on the value and efficacy of different types of divination, and this forms his appeal to ancient authority. It is not the case, according to Quintus, that augurs set out to fool the people; the example of the city foundation proves it.

This scene is important to the twins' biography: its outcome marks the beginning of the distinction between Romulus and Remus. From this point forward, Romulus is the successful twin, destined to become the founder of Rome; Remus is the loser, with no further function to fulfill.[35] In his account, Ennius uses language that suggests that the twins were equal competitors and that the outcome of the augury was not predetermined. This reading places Remus in his rightful position as Romulus' twin and equal,[36] and may offer a more collegial resolution to the contest: Romulus clearly founds Rome, but the door lies open for Remus to become the founder of a new community.

My reconstruction of the narrative is of necessity only suggestive. As Jackie Elliott has recently argued, the Ennius we have received is not necessarily the Ennius known in antiquity; instead, the text is a collection of citations chosen for very specific purposes, which themselves are often quite separate from the text.[37] Cicero in particular supplies a great amount of material and we must be cautious, as "Cicero makes Ennius his benchmark for creative reconstruction of 'historical' figures."[38] In the case of the Romulus narrative, we have information from a variety of sources. Of the passages I will discuss, only the augury

35 See ver Eecke 2008:207, with some further sources; the idea that the differentiation of the twins occurs at either the Lupercalia or the augury is fairly common. In contrast, Mencacci 1996:89 argues that the twins' duality is inherent to their regal authority.

36 Armstrong 2013:56–9 argues that such equality cannot fully exist among mythic brothers, although he agrees that it is "an ideal" (p. 58).

37 Elliott 2013:75–82.

38 Elliott 2013:44 (speaking about *Div.* 2.115). See also p. 198, "Ennius' representation of Roman history was crucial to how Republican Romans understood their past in its relationship to their present identity."

contest (immediately below) is marked as coming from the story of the foundation; fitting the other fragments into the narrative of the foundation, as I discuss below, is much more problematic.

Because the augury fragment will occupy the majority of the chapter, I offer it in full below. I will return to segments of it periodically over the next 15 pages. Although not without problems, it is in many ways the easiest of the Romulus fragments; Cicero's introduction (*Romulus augur ut apud Ennium est, cum frater item augure*) clarifies the context considerably.[39] Without a means of checking against a complete text, the interpretation that I propose must remain speculative. But my reading is more consonant with another early fragment about the city's foundation, that of Cassius Hemina.[40] His account stresses the importance of cooperation and productive rivalry. I suggest that a similar emphasis is present in Ennius' account of the auspice-taking for the foundation of the city, which differs from some of the later accounts I discuss in chapters three and six.

> Curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes
> Regni dant operam simul auspicio augurioque.
> In Murco Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam[41]
> Solus avem servat. at Romulus pulcher in alto
> Quaerit Aventino, servat genus altivolantum.
> Certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent.
> Omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator.
> Expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum
> Volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras
> Quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:
> Sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat.
> Rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.
> Interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis.
> Exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux
> Et simul ex alto longe pulcherrima praepes
> Laeva volavit avis: simul aureus exoritur sol.

---

39 Cic. *Div.* 1.107, "Romulus the augur, with his brother also an augur, as in Ennius." For the historical background to this dialogue, see Santangelo 2013:10–36.

40 Discussed below, pp. 49–53.

41 This passage is without a doubt corrupt, with manuscript readings as follows: *se devovet atque* B: *se devoveratq* V: *se devoverat quae* AH. I have printed the text of Skutsch 1985; however, I include his suggested emendation of *monte* to *Murco*.

Cedunt de caelo ter quattor corpora sancta
Avium, praepetibus sese pulchrisque locis dant.
Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim[42]
Auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.[43]

The general sense of the passage is clear: Romulus and Remus each try to gain favorable auspices in order to found the city; they engage in a public contest to gain this honor; ultimately, Romulus is the winner. The details of the passage, however, have been hotly disputed. My primary concern here is the result of the auspices.[44] I argue that Remus' auspication was successful, but not in a way that made him an appropriate founder for the city. Romulus' augury was superior, which reserved for him the right of foundation. The idea that both twins see a sign maintains the equality of their competition. Although in this contest there can only be one winner, Remus is not left with nothing. His lesser result is worthy of remembrance and honor, as in the historical examples of Claudius Nero or Decius Mus examined above. Ennius thus offers a version of the foundation narrative that is in line with the values ensconced in the Republican governmental system, as well as with the system of collegiality and shared power accepted by the political elite.

---

42 All manuscripts read *propriam*; this was corrected to *priora* in B (according to Giomini 1975:ix, a more corrupt manuscript). Jocelyn 1971:72–4 makes a strong argument that Lucian Mueller's *propritim*, followed by Skutsch, is incorrect. He in turn supports the medieval *priora*, which has been followed by several others (e.g., Barchiesi 1997:169n50). I would then translate "Romulus saw that the better signs had been given to him: the throne . . ." See below, pp. 42–3.

43 Enn. *Ann.* 72–91 Sk., "Caring with great care and at the same time desiring kingship, they performed auspices and augury at the same time. On the Murcus (MSS: *monte*, hill) Remus sat in auspicy and alone watched for a favorable bird. But fortunate Romulus searched on the high Aventine and watched for a race of high-fliers. They fought over whether to call the city Rome or Remora. Everyone was concerned to see which one would be leader. They were watching, like when a consul is about to give the signal: then everyone looks eagerly at the gates of the starting-points, where soon the painted chariots will burst out of the openings—thus people were waiting and showed fear on their faces. At issue was which one would gain the victory and the great kingdom. Meanwhile the bright sun sank back into the dark of night. Then the shining light, striking out with its rays, showed itself, and from way up in the air, an exceptionally lucky favorable bird flew on the left, at the same time as the golden sun rose. There came down from heaven twelve sacred bodies of birds, and they appeared in favorable and fortunate places. From this Romulus saw that the throne confirmed by the auspices and the royal territory were given to him alone."

44 For further problems of interpretation, see Skutsch 1985 *ad loc.*

Ennius' account of the augury scene, while lengthy, has a few textual problems. Two in particular affect the argument. I discuss the ungrammatical *propriam* of line 90 below; the more extensive issues of line 74 require more immediate and sustained attention. The line is unmetrical as transmitted. To date, several major corrections have been suggested; none has met with unqualified approval. The most widely accepted is the emendation offered by Otto Skutsch, who argued first, that *monte* is inadequate as a location compared to *Aventino* (line 76), and second, that *se devovet* does not semantically fit the passage. He emended the first to *Murco*, and this is widely accepted as both correct and ingenious.[45] His solution to the second problem was emending *auspicio se devoverat* to *auspicio sedet* on the basis of a variety of passages in Plutarch.[46] This has been accepted by the majority of subsequent editions, although it has not gone unquestioned.[47]

More recently, Enrico Flores proposed an extensive emendation of the transmitted text:

> Monte in <Aventino atque> ab laeva rite probatum<st>: (81 Fl.)
> <nam> Remus auspicio se devovet atque secundam
> solus avem servat. At Romulus pulcer in alto
> monte Palatino servat genus altivolantum.[48]

This emendation smoothes away all variance from the version found in Livy, but is not itself without problems; most notable is the change of tense in Flores' line 81 compared with 82–4. In his commentary on the passage, Flores suggests that Ennius had Remus see his own favorable omen first, in the section of text quoted above. Then the simile appears in order to increase narrative tension, and after this Romulus sees his own, more favorable, omen.[49] Ver Eecke has rightly contested this emendation, arguing that it is a mistake to "forcer le

45 Skutsch 1968:64–70.

46 Plut. *Rom.* 22.1; *Cam.* 32.7; *Marc.* 5.2; *Caes.* 47.3; see Skutsch 1985:225.

47 Silent acceptance in e.g. Freyburger and Scheid 1992, Wardle 2006, ver Eecke 2006; accepted with some explanation, Gratwick 1987, Ross 1988, Schäublin 1991. For criticism, see Timpanaro 1999:312, "la correzione di *se devovet* in *sedet*, ben argomentata [da Skutsch], lascia tuttavia dubbiosi" (however, compare Timpanaro 1970:359, on the same emendation: "audace ma molto acuta"). See also Rüpke 2004:27, who obelizes *solus* in the next line and translates, "Remus is sitting on the mountain (Murcus?), offered himself for a sign by the birds, and for a positive bird (on the ground?) he looks."

48 Flores 2002:46 (fr. 51), original italicization; *ab laeva rite probatum'st* is Skutsch's *sedis incertae* fr. 152.

49 Flores et al. 2002:55–6.

témoinage d'Ennius" to fit later accounts.[50] Instead, we ought to understand the text as transmitted as best as possible.

Earlier generations of editors also tried to work with the manuscript reading. Lucian Mueller in the late 19th century posited a long lacuna: thus his text offered *hinc in monte Remus . . . / . . . auspicio se devovet atque secundam*.[51] This is similar to the text of Johannes Vahlen, who offered . . . *in monte* . . . / . . . *Remus auspicio*, etc.[52] Vahlen's edition, with a lacuna rather than an emendation, was the standard until Skutsch.[53] H. D. Jocelyn similarly did not emend, but instead obelized *in monte* and argued in favor of the manuscript reading *se devovet*.[54] Jocelyn's reading was followed by Wiseman in his influential book on Remus; their reasoning lies in *se devovet* as the *lectio difficilior*.[55] Wiseman suggests that Remus may have "ma[d]e a deal with the gods of the underworld" (to secure victory?). This is also what Jocelyn suggested, but he in addition wished to see negative consequences for such a vow: his larger argument supported Hermann Strasburger's theory that the Romulus and Remus story was invented by a hostile source.[56] Ennius was, at best, making the most of a bad situation by having Remus sacrifice his life.

That *se devovere* is the *lectio difficilior* is undeniable. But equally undeniable is Skutsch's argument for semantics; as he rightly points out, *devovere* does not mean 'spend time on' or 'pay attention to' until late antiquity. This is too late for Ennius, but not for a marginal gloss. The alternative, which is to understand *devovere* in a religious sense, does not fit with anything we know about augury in Republican Rome, a point that was forcefully argued by Jerzy Linderski.[57] Moreover, it does not fit with the other instances of *devotio*.[58] This rite is fairly well documented in ancient sources; in it, a general sacrifices himself for the sake of his troops and the victory of Rome. It is difficult to imagine how this would have worked for Remus as the potential founder of the city, with no battle, no troops, and the need to live for at least a little while after the augury.

---

50 ver Eecke 2006:78.

51 Mueller 1884:12.

52 Vahlen[3] 1963:14.

53 Followed by, e.g., Steuart 1925; Segura Morena 1984.

54 Jocelyn 1971:60–3.

55 See Wiseman 1995:171n33. *Lectio difficilior*: see Jocelyn 1971:62, "its very difficulty should make one chary of emendation."

56 Jocelyn 1971; Strasburger 1968.

57 Linderski 1989 = 1995:527–30; reiterated in Linderski 2007:3–20. Linderski 1989 favors Skutsch.

58 For the *devotio* of the Decii, see e.g. Livy 8.9.4–9, 10.28.12–29.5; Versnel 1976, Janssen 1981, and Feldherr 1998:82–92, with further references.

Finally, there is the problem of tenses; as Skutsch pointed out, the majority of the tenses are in the durative present.[59] Of the surviving readings, only that of MS B offers the present *devovet*. This is an early manuscript, but according to its editor, also very corrupt.[60] The *lectio difficilior* creates a more intractable text.

While Skutsch's *sedet*, then, is not ideal, the retention of *se devovet* is equally problematic. My own preference is the elimination of the repetitive *auspicio*, but a defensible and compelling supplement does not present itself.[61] I have chosen to retain Skutsch's emendation in my discussion because *sedet* is a more difficult reading for my argument of a fundamentally positive foundation legend in the *Annales*; if we include Remus' *devotio*, Romulus cannot be at fault for his brother's death. After proving the more difficult case, I will return briefly at the end to the potential significance of a *devotio* in this context.

In what follows, then, I proceed under the assumption that in the corrupt line and a half dedicated to Remus, Ennius provides us with much the same information as he is about to provide for Romulus: a location and a sign. The location, which does not affect my argument, is in the corrupt line 74. The information about the sign, however (*Remus ... secundam / solus avem servat*), remains relatively secure, set off by the strong connective *atque*.[62]

Most scholarship on this passage assumes that one of Ennius' peculiarities, together with the fact that Romulus does not auspicate from the Palatine, is the fact that Remus receives no omen.[63] Otto Skutsch argued that the missing omen was original to the Ennian text: "since Cicero quotes the passage to illustrate the nature of augury it seems inconceivable that he should have omit-

59 Skutsch 1985:222.

60 See Giomini 1975, although it is worth noting that this manuscript does produce the likely correction *priora*.

61 An ideal solution would see Remus' prayer (*vovet*), with a recipient (*diis*) or offering (*hostiam*?); these examples are metrically unlikely, but give a sense of what may be missing. *imo* would nicely parallel *alto Aventino*. For Roman prayer language, see e.g. Hickson Hahn 1993 and the collection of Chapot and Laurot 2001.

62 Wiseman 1995a:171n33 supports the elimination of *secundam* as redundant, citing Jordan 1885:8; I read Jordan's comment as saying *secundam* is ugly or inelegant (*parum apte dictum*), not redundant. But this is not taking into account the meaning of 'favorable' (on which see below, and Massey 2004–6).

63 E.g., Skutsch 1968:77–8 and 1985:222–3; Timpanaro 1999:311–13; Linderski 2007:18–19. Wiseman 1995a:6–7 and Flores 2002:55 support the idea that both twins receive a sign, but their suggestions differ from mine; Flores emends extensively, and Wiseman simply asserts. Schäublin 1991 and Freyberger and Scheid 1992 offer no opinion, while Jocelyn 1971 is agnostic (cf. pp. 55–6 vs. 69–70).

ted a part of the story most relevant to his purpose."[64] I agree with Skutsch's logic, but in contrast to this majority opinion, I suggest that Remus did receive an omen. This dual augury reveals the importance of equality in competition in second-century Rome. Such equality is in line with recent work on the Republic's political culture.[65]

Returning to the augury contest, the narrative is picked up again after an extended simile, in which the anticipation of the future citizens of Rome is compared to a crowd waiting for the consul to begin a chariot race. This again reinforces the point that Romulus and Remus are starting from a fair position, as charioteers would, although both cannot win. But the chariot-race simile in particular highlights the potential for future honors for the loser. Ennius' explicit model in writing the *Annales* was Homer.[66] At the famous chariot race in the *Iliad*, during the funeral games of Patroclus, Homer makes it clear that while there is only one winner (Diomedes), even the last contestant to arrive receives a prize.[67] Moreover, this is true of all the contests—even including boxing and wrestling, where only two men compete.[68] In the Homeric world, all competitors receive a token.

Ennius may have applied a similar reasoning to Romulus and Remus: both compete, both are heroes, and therefore both get a prize, even if only Romulus gets *the* prize of founding Rome. Ennius says that the twins' argument is over who will be eponym of the city (line 77); Remus could conceivably still play a role in its development. Finally, there comes the augury itself.

> Exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux
> Et simul ex alto longe pulcherrima praepes
> Laeva volavit avis. Simul aureus exoritur sol
> Cedunt de caelo ter quattor corpora sancta
> Avium, praepetibus sese pulchrisque locis dant.
> Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim
> Auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.

---

64 Skutsch 1961:77.

65 E.g., Rosenstein 1990; Pittenger 2008; Hölkeskamp 2010.

66 See e.g. Enn. *Ann*. 13 Sk.; Elliott 2013 in general, but see e.g. p. 10 (on Ennius' "macroscopic engagement with Homer") or 66 (on "the work's constantly advertised relationship to Homer").

67 Hom. *Il*. 23.535–70 in particular.

68 See Hom. *Il*. 23.658–63; 700–705.

First one bird is seen, an "extremely lucky" one, that flies in from the left at the moment of dawn. After this, twelve sacred birds appear, flying to the favorable parts of the augural *templum*. At this point, Romulus realizes that he alone has received the kingship.

The bird in line 87 is the source of the confusion in this passage. Skutsch wanted to see the *avis* as essentially a plural, a first sign of what Romulus was to see.[69] He explained, "the singular must not be used to connect this omen with Remus, who *avem servat*, as opposed to the twelve birds of Romulus who *servat genus altivolantum*" because the single *avis* is used "in the collective sense normal in augural language, where the word does not necessarily denote a single bird, but a 'flight.'"[70] Furthermore, *pulcherrima* "would not be aptly applied to the sign given to the loser."[71] But Remus, just like Romulus, is a demigod consulting his family for an indication of favor. Again, if we compare the Homeric precedents from *Iliad* 23, it is unlikely that such a hero would be let down lightly. As is clear from later accounts, in which both twins receive a sign, the notion that the gods give a favorable omen to Remus does not preclude them giving a more favorable sign to Romulus. Moreover, Skutsch's interpretation of the *pulcherrima* ... *avis* as a flock does not rule out the idea that it was Remus' omen. Although Skutsch understood it as Romulus' twelve birds, it may refer with equal probability to the six birds of Remus that are canonical in the tradition and that Skutsch considers a "late" addition.[72]

In seeing the *avis* as Romulus' sign, Skutsch may have been influenced by the fact that the section in Cicero that immediately precedes this passage also includes an augury scene, part of Cicero's poem on Marius' consulship. Skutsch noted that Cicero "is clearly influenced by Ennius" in the passage, which of course has only one augury: Marius'.[73] But in this case there is only one augur, while Cicero introduces the Ennius fragment by emphasizing that there are

---

69 Skutsch 1985:222–3 and 233–7. Wiseman 1995a:6–7 insists that there are two groups of birds; on p. 172n40 he criticizes Skutsch's interpretation. Flores 2002:46–7 suggests that Remus' augury comes before the extended simile. This requires extensive emendation to the text, as discussed above, and seems to me too bold.

70 Skutsch 1985:234, on the authority of Varro *LL* 6.82; most of the examples Skutsch cites, though, have the plural *aves*.

71 Skutsch 1985:233; see Linderski 2007:5.

72 Skutsch 1985:235.

73 Skutsch 1985:237. On the importance of considering Cicero's choices in the transmission of Ennius, see Zetzel 2007, followed by Baraz 2012:21 and greatly elaborated by Elliott 2013; see also Cole 2006 for Cicero's use of Ennius to invent tradition. See also e.g. Gildenhard 2006 and Atkins 2013:19 and 33–43 for the importance of Cicero's Skeptic background in understanding the *philosophica*.

two augurs, and therefore, presumably, two auguries: *Romulus augur ... cum fratre item augure*.[74] The parallelism between Cicero (as poet) and Ennius here must not be taken too far.

Another objection came from Linderski, who rejected both Skutsch's interpretation and the idea that the bird belongs to Remus on augural grounds.[75] He argued that it must be the first of Romulus' twelve, an assertion that he never explained. Indeed, his statement that "to an augurally minded reader" Remus' name implies the *remores aves* seems rather to imply that Roman readers would expect Remus to receive a sign, albeit an unfavorable one counseling delay.[76] Such an interpretation also accords well with Linderski's observation that "we only very infrequently hear of the negative outcome of the consultation at an *augurium*."[77] To have both brothers receive an omen is consistent with the Roman practice of recording auspication. It is also clear that from a religious perspective, two signs were possible.[78] We see this in the later accounts, such as Ovid and Livy. If it were impossible from a religious perspective to have two auguries, such a problem would at least be noted by one of the ancient authors.

Interpretation of the passage hinges on the question of whether the initial bird of lines 86–7 is one of the twelve birds of lines 88–9. There is no reason internal to the text to believe that it is. In fact, Ennius' phrasing speaks against it: there is no indication that a single bird was leading the flock. The description of the second group of birds—*cedunt ... ter quattor corpora*—shows that there was not a single leading bird, but rather three groups of four birds each. This choice of numbers should not be ascribed to the meter, as Ovid offers two groups of six in his description of the same scene.[79] Thus there is no reason intrinsic to the text to believe that there was an individual bird in the lead (that is, in v-formation), rather than a cluster.[80]

It is also unlikely that both Romulus and Remus would set out to watch for birds, but only one of the twins would be successful; this contradicts both epic norms of how to treat a hero and the practice of recording auspication. It is

74 Cic. *Div*. 107, "Romulus the augur, with his brother likewise an augur."

75 Linderski 2007:4n4.

76 Linderski 2007:18.

77 Linderski 1986:2294.

78 See Linderski 2007:19, "a subsequent stronger sign annuls the earlier weaker message."

79 Ov. *F.* 4.817; this is to highlight the contrast between Remus' six birds and Romulus' twelve. Ovid's account of the Romulus story is rich in "Ennian echoes" (Barchiesi 1997:170; see also Hinds 1992a:108); I discuss it further in chapters four and six below.

80 Modern ornithologists suggest that cluster flocking is more typical; see Usherwood et al. 2011.

also inconsistent with Ennius' earlier presentation of the two brothers. In lines 72–6, he gives an equal amount of description to each.[81] Granted, the augury contest marks the point at which the twins cease to be equal: Romulus wins, Remus does not. But this does not mean that Remus must be ignored. If the *avis* of line 86 is the same as the *corpora ... avium* of lines 87–8, Remus not only does not receive a positive sign, but he also does not receive a negative sign. The narrative then loses its balance; Remus neither succeeds nor fails, simply drops out of sight. If we see the first bird as Remus' bird, however, the twins again receive roughly the same amount of space for the description of their individual omens, as they received roughly the same amount of space when setting up the augury. Such balance is consistent with Cicero's introduction of the fragment.

My reading returns a measure of symmetry to the twins: each one sees his own omen, although the significance of these two signs is not the same. The passage begins with both of them equal, with a line and a half dedicated to the description of their positions while watching the sky. This is followed by a moment of tension as the watching crowd, waiting (like Ennius' reader) for the outcome, is described in a long simile. The narrative picks up again with more balance as the omens are revealed: first the *pulcherrima praepes*, which, if it is Remus' bird, would immediately lead the internal audience to believe that he had won. This would be surprising for Ennius' reader, who knows that it is Romulus who founds the city, and offers dramatic tension: what is Ennius doing with this story? In the next two and a half lines, Romulus' omen is revealed. This is a far better omen: it is from this that Romulus understands his destiny.[82]

This interpretation supports the medieval emendation *priora* over Mueller's *propritim.*[83] Jocelyn championed this reading, arguing that "as in a lottery between two magistrates concerning *prouinciae* or precedence, Romulus had defeated Remus for the right to inaugurate the Palatine site."[84] Although Jocelyn did not follow that thought further, this is in fact exactly the sort of behavior we should expect to see in good competition: strong rivalry between the Roman elite that nonetheless yielded substantial benefits. The city profited from such rivalry. Ennius thus presents Romulus and Remus striving for the good of the city. His account could have ended with some further benefit for Remus as well, whether explicitly granted or merely implied by the competition.

81 Cf. Skutsch 1968:71 on the issue of equality between the brothers.

82 A similar description can be found in Flores 2002:55.

83 See above, p. 35n42.

84 Jocelyn 1971:73.

Such a contest fits well with Karl Hölkeskamp's idea of equality of opportunity as a key feature of aristocratic competition in the second century.[85]

A passage of Festus offers further support for my interpretation of Remus' bird. Under the heading of *praepetes*, we find: *praepetes aves quidam dici aiunt, quia secundum auspicium faciant praetervolantes*.[86] The word *secundum* is not part of normal augural terminology. According to Linderski, augural texts call favorable birds *benevolantes*, *sinentes*, or *praepetes.*[87] Festus' antiquarian work would be expected to use these words if its source were an augural text. His information here, then, seems to come from a different type of work.

Festus' language recalls Remus' watch for a *secundam avem*, as well as the first *pulcherrima praepes* that is seen. The augury contest includes all of the words in question. There is a strong possibility, then, that Festus' definition of *praepetes aves* is based on this Ennian passage, a parallel that was overlooked by Skutsch.[88] Because the *secundam avem* is a somewhat unusual term,[89] Festus' connection of the two is significant.[90] It connects the *praepes* to Remus by equating the *praepetes aves* with a *secundum auspicium*. It also provides a bit of wordplay that helps explain Remus' failure. *Secundus* can mean 'favorable', but also 'second'; Remus, in his hope to see a good bird, perhaps sets himself up to fall short. Although his bird is seen first, he comes in second place.

Romulus may not have been the clear winner, despite his better auspices. Ennius was interested in the story of Rome, and thus his Romulus is the more

85 See Hölkeskamp 2010:98–106.

86 Fest. 224L, "some say that the *praepetes aves* [favorable birds] are so called because they make an auspice favorable by flying by."

87 See Linderski 1986:2282–2286, Torelli 1966 and 1969:39–48. This is not to say that '*secundus*' only rarely means favorable; this meaning is actually quite common. But the term is more commonly associated with *fortuna* or *eventus*, or even gods, than with augury or auspicy.

88 See Skutsch 1985:233–6.

89 See Skutsch 1985:225. A PHI search for *secundum auspicium* shows that it appears elsewhere only at Hor. *Carm.* 4.14, Livy 9.14.1, and Suet. *Galba* 9.1; in none of these is a similar augural context secure, and in Livy it is ruled out by the mention of a *pullarius*. Needless to say, in none of these instances do all of the relevant words appear.

90 I do not mean to imply that Festus has made this connection himself. It may come from Verrius Flaccus or perhaps even an older work. The reference to "poets" who use this word as a synonym for birds implies that one (or both) of these authors is unaware of the connection to Ennius, despite the clear verbal echoes. According to Strzelecki's hierarchy of poetic sources, it is possible that Ennius could even have been mentioned in the original lemma; Ennius holds both the second and seventeenth (and last) spot (see Strzelecki 1932:81–3, with examples pp. 83–7). In this regard, it is relevant that Strzelecki 1932:77–8 argues that Verrius' source here was a book on augury, but does not explain who the *poetae* were.

successful twin. Other versions, traces of which survive in later authors, suggest the possibility of joint foundation.[91] These may have drawn on a source similar to Ennius, if not the *Annales* itself; it is worth emphasizing again that the contest is initially over the name of the city, rather than its leader. Elements of this tradition were flexible.

We know that according to Ennius, only one of the twins was destined for immortality: *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli / templa*.[92] The use of the indefinite *unus* perhaps means that in narrative time, the favored twin was as yet unknown.[93] After the augury, however, the fates of the two had been sealed. Such a scenario would also be similar to the development of the Romulean narrative outlined by ver Eecke in her recent monograph on the development of the Romulus legend. In this work, she argues that the auspicy-taking is the decisive moment between the twins until the Sullan period.[94] In this argument, Romulus is the favored twin; yet many scholars have noted that Remus often seems to be the more favored twin in the founders' youth.[95] How and why this changes (or if it did, in Ennius' tale) is not clear.

I suggest, in contrast, that the story we have in Ennius is similar in plot to that we find in the 'vulgate' tradition; the differences lie primarily in the message each author draws from the material. In Ennius, as in other sources, both

91 See the sources cited above, n. 10, along with Cassius Hemina, whose evidence I will discuss in more detail below.

92 Enn. *Ann.* 54 Sk., "there will be one whom you will carry into the blue skies of heaven." Although this fragment is not explicitly attributed to Ennius, it is strongly suggested by its appearance in Varro (*LL* 7.6, without attribution) and Ovid (whose work supplies the context; see next note). The use of *templa* here, an augural term, is probably not significant (cf. line 48 for a similar usage). Varro's quotation makes it fairly clear that it is to be understood as 'sky': *Templum tribus modis dicitur: ab natura, ab auspicando, a similitudine; ab natura in caelo, ab auspiciis in terra, a similitudine sub terra* ("'*templum*' has three meanings: one from nature, one from auspicy, and one from extrapolation. The one based in nature refers to 'heaven'; the one based on auspicy, to 'earth'; and the one based on extrapolation lies under the earth"). See Linderski 1986:2261–2264.

93 In fact, Ovid twice uses this exact phrase (*Met.* 14.814 and *F.* 2.487); in both cases, Mars speaks to Jupiter directly before the disappearance and deification of Romulus. This may indicate the placement of the fragment in Ennius; Skutsch 1985:205, however, suggests that it is spoken at the time of the twins' exposure.

94 E.g., ver Eecke 2008:312–5. Her conclusions about the early evidence are largely drawn from the narratives found in the sources, and as a result she works backwards from the later first century, when evidence is fairly rich; she also suggests that there was a purposeful change in Cicero's depiction of the twins in the *DRP*, to which I will return below (see p. 78–79).

95 See ver Eecke 2008:199–200, with further bibliography; see also below, chapter four, for Remus' apparent primacy at the Lupercalia.

twins seek an omen hoping to be designated the founder. In Ennius, as in other sources, Remus is successful, but only partially: the gods grant him a favorable sign, as he asked, but grant Romulus one, too. Romulus' sign is stronger, thus trumping Remus' and confirming him as founder of the city.

In sum, there is no need to assume that Remus received no sign at all, particularly when the two groups of birds are separated by the half-line on the rising sun. We know from later sources that it was possible in religious terms for both twins to receive a sign, so long as Romulus' sign was better. It is more likely that each one received an omen, but that Remus' omen was inferior to his brother's. This interpretation fulfills the expectation from the beginning of the passage, where both Romulus and Remus are watching for birds, and matches Cicero's introduction of the fragment more closely. Still, one twin had to fail; Remus did not receive sufficient favor. This version of the story, while different from the later versions in which Remus sees six birds, remains similar enough to link Ennius with the later tradition. The story in Ennius, as opposed to later versions, offers a didactic vision of elite competition, one in which the tension of ambition and collegiality can be resolved to the honor of both parties.

The End of the Contest

The augury contest marks the disruption of the pre-existing balance between the twins. Until Romulus' superior sign, they were equals; from this point forward, they cease to be, at least in terms of the history of Rome. For some reason, only *one* of the twins will be allowed to found the city. This is clear from Romulus' acceptance and understanding of his sign as *priora*: the comparative used here implies that Remus is the weaker of the two. Although we lack many indications of how Ennius handled the general arc of the Romulus and Remus plot, we do know that only one twin will become immortal. Even if other opportunities did exist for Remus, in Ennius' account only Romulus founds Rome. This is part of the pattern that appears repeatedly in Roman mythology and even in Roman historiography: when two characters are strongly associated and perform many heroic deeds together, only one ultimately survives or prospers. The balance seen in Ennius' account of the augury contest suggests that this pattern is both old and intentional. Remus is a crucial part of the story,[96] and his failure is just as important as Romulus' success.

96 *pace* Wiseman 1995a:117; assuming that Remus is a late or accidental appendage minimizes the value of Roman legend.

The twins' story illustrates the nature of elite competition. In Ennius, the scenario seems ideal: two equals compete for a valuable goal, and while both are successful, one is more successful. Ennius' language also makes this clear. In the *Annales*, although the twins initially set out *auspicio augurioque*, in the end only one result is reported, that of the auspices. As Jerzy Linderski has emphasized, the auspices grant temporary approval;[97] we are left with the possibility that Remus could still achieve part of his goal.[98] This is a productive type of competition, which leaves the loser with the possibility of one day becoming a winner, too. It is the possibility, rather than the outcome, which matters; even if Remus dies, the competition remains fair.

The end of this story in Ennius remains uncertain, and I discuss it both for completeness and because the death of Remus will be the focus of chapters three and five. Ennius' account of the fratricide is extremely fragmentary. The fragments we possess are short and two of them (frr. 92 and 93 Skutsch) are quoted solely for linguistic interest.[99] The longer fragment 94–5 is cited by Macrobius, who compares it to a thoroughly different context in Vergil.[100]

Skutsch suggested that the pieces of the traditional story are all present. He put forward a series of fragments to support this claim: *Iuppiter ut muro fretus magis quamde manu sim*,[101] *nec pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus / hoc nec tu: nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas*,[102] and *ast hic quem nunc tu tam torviter increpuisti*.[103] According to Skutsch, these provide the bare bones of the story that later became canonical: Romulus remonstrating with Remus

---

97 Linderski 1986:2296.

98 In OGR 23.6 (= Egnatius *FRHist* 106 F1), for example, Remus is said to have outlived Romulus; in such a version, he could easily have become king, or founded his own city. Greek historians supply brothers of Romulus who found their own cities; see the list at DH 1.72–3 and ver Eecke's discussion (2008:196–8).

99 Enn. *Ann.* 92 is from Festus; *Ann.* 93 from Nonius.

100 Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.15, referring to *Aen.* 9.420; the Vergilian passage is about a Latin killing Euryalus in recompense for his sniping.

101 Enn. *Ann.* 92, "Jupiter! as I rely on the wall more than my hand." See Skutsch 1985:238, who remarks, "Remus having expressed contempt for the wall by leaping over it the line fits [sic] very well into the context of the quarrel, and it is therefore unnecessary to make the speaker a leader of the Sabines (or Romulus replying to him), who as descendants of the Lacedaimonians prided themselves on living in un-walled settlements." This was not his position earlier; in Skutsch 1960:191–2, he argued strongly *against* this fragment depicting Remus at the wall.

102 Enn. *Ann.* 94–5, "by Pollux, no man alive shall do this without penalty, not even you; for you will pay the price in blood."

103 Enn. *Ann.* 93, "but this man, whom just now you rebuked so fiercely." I have given these out of order because Skutsch 1985:239 offers two possibilities for the context of this fragment: the death of Remus or Amulius and Numitor holding Remus prisoner (Vahlen's

about the strength of the wall, then growing angry when Remus leapt across it, and the report of an argument.

None of these fragments are unequivocal, as Skutsch himself realized (see notes); at the very least, there is no indication that Ennius preferred to assign the blame for Remus' death to Romulus rather than to a figure like Celer. The question becomes even more problematic if space is granted for a *devotio*, as discussed above; then Remus' death would be due to his own wishes.

Our knowledge of the *Annales* and their subject matter do not allow us to locate these fragments in a secure context. Their citations by late antique authors only tell us that these fragments come from the first book, which ended with the death of Romulus. Thus these fragments may indeed come from a section on Troy or Romulus' Sabine wars.[104] Indeed, *Annales* 92 seems to have been spoken at a time when the city walls were already built; there is no need to assume that they are even the walls of Rome. It is the second fragment, *Annales* 94–5, that is most likely to relate to the twins' quarrel: *nec tu* may imply a close relationship.[105] But when we do not known the contents of the *Annales* or the context (or order) of the surviving fragments, it is dangerous to place too much emphasis on two words.

Elliott cautions that these fragments in particular "are regularly attributed to the foundation-story, but in fact the reference of these fragments is obscure; they are attributed to the foundation-story only because their sources assign them to Book I."[106] There is little evidence intrinsic to the texts to connect them to Romulus and Remus. Elliott's closest parallels for *Ann.* 94–5 in second-century literature come from comedy; while survival makes this unsurprising, it is worth noting that in Terence, *pol* is more frequently spoken by women than men.[107] Although we cannot say that this was true in Ennius, we must be hesitant about the place of this fragment in the *Annales.*

suggestion). He finds the death of Remus "probable", but this seems uncertain enough to warrant withholding judgment.

104 See Skutsch 1985:142–3 and 263–4 for a description of the contents of the first two books. This has now been questioned by Elliott 2013; see esp. p. 66 on the problematic "assumption that the *Annales*, as an 'historical' account, were based on historical records of the priests and followed the historiographical procedures that was felt to imply."

105 Still, the source of the quotation leaves doubts; the parallel between the deaths of Remus and Euryalus is not strong. In the latter case, the address is not used (see Verg. *Aen.* 9.420–1*: 'tu tamen interea calido mihi sanguine poenas / persolves amborum' inquit*, "but, he said, you meanwhile will repay me with your warm blood as a punishment for both").

106 Elliott 2013:247n60.

107 See Elliott 2013:127–8, citing comic parallels. On Terence, see Adams 1984; Karakasis 2005:9.

If these fragments describe a fight between Romulus and Remus, the result still may not be a negative picture of the founder as fratricide. At the very least, it shows him to be the hapless instrument of fate. In contrast, the paean that Ennius offers the dead king emphasizes his positive and active contributions to the community, a depiction that is consistent with the poem's later status as a national epic.[108] It is thus, at the very least, more likely that Ennius' account of Remus' death did not place the blame on Romulus. If Remus did die soon after the augury, it may have been at the hands of an associate or an anonymous mob, as in later, more favorable portrayals of Romulus.

Killing close relations because of the threats they pose to a ruler's powers is a tyrannical trope. Such a characterization is out of place for this Romulus, who in the surviving fragments is consistently represented as divine. The tyrannical overtones found in later accounts of Romulus' kingship are missing from Ennius' account. Because the work is fragmentary, we cannot be certain of this absence. But the apparent absence of tyranny is thematically similar to the most complete Romulus and Remus fragment, and accords well with the later apotheosis of Romulus. Like the productive competition seen in the augury contest, it suggests that the foundation story could be presented as a positive model for aristocratic rivalry, through which the community as a whole was the chief beneficiary. In the potential case of a *devotio*, both twins could even have benefitted the community, as we see in Livy's account of Fabius and Decius.

Stress on the communal nature of a twin relationship would perhaps make more sense for the period between the second and third Punic Wars, when Rome was recovering her strength and also vastly increasing the empire. In Ennius' celebration of Rome's history, it is possible that Remus' death would not have been presented as a problematic curse to later generations, nor an embarrassing incident to be glossed over. In a Rome that did not know civil war, the prominence of a single leader at a crucial moment was not in itself a problem. The equality that we see established between Romulus and Remus suggests that joint rule is possible, if not always preferable, and that limited competition can have a positive outcome. This sets the tone for Romulus' reign as a just king who prefigures the consular harmony of the Republic's peak.

---

108 Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 106–9 Sk. A more positive depiction of a moderate Romulus may have been seen in a fragment of Piso (*FRHist* 9 F10 [with commentary *ad loc.*] = 10 Chassignet = 10 B-W = 8 P = 13 Forsythe); see Linderski 2002a.

Cassius Hemina

A similar vision of equality and fair play seems to be present in the fragments of Cassius Hemina's history. Hemina's work is not well-known, but it is usually dated to the mid-second century. In his account, the twins share rule with peaceful collegiality:

> pastorum vulgus sine contentione consentiendo praefecerunt aequaliter imperio Remum et Romulum, ita ut de regno pararent inter se. Monstrum fit: sus parit porcos triginta . . .[109]

Here, the possibility of Romulus and Remus ruling together seems much more real. Hemina's language emphasizes the equality and lack of strife between the twins at this juncture, as well as the universality of the shepherds' wishes. The twins' choice to share rule is marked by an omen of fertility, suggesting the benefit of cooperation to the future city. As Beck and Walter note in their commentary on this passage,

> Auffällig ist der pleonastisch unterstrichene Grundtenor des Konsenses und der Balance: Der Entschluss der Hirten ist unstrittig, die Zwillinge sollen gleichberechtigte Anführer sein und in Eintracht handeln . . . damit ist zugleich die Antithese zu dem von Ennius als Agon gestalteten Auguralstreit unter den Augen der künftigen Bürger Roms formuliert.[110]

Hemina seems to have offered a significantly more pacific version of the legend than that which we read in the late Republic. The earliest editors even interpreted the phrase *parent inter se* (which Gronovius emended to *pararent* in the seventeenth century) as *pares inter se essent*.[111] In Hemina's account

---

109 Hemina (*FRHist* 6 F14 = 14 Chassignet = 14 B-W = 11 P = 14 S), "the crowd of shepherds, by consensus and without contention, offered power to Romulus and Remus equally, so that they could divide the kingship between them. There was an omen: a sow gave birth to thirty piglets . . ."

110 Beck-Walter 2001 [2005]:257 (commentary on Hemina fr. 14). Cf. von Ungern-Sternberg 1993:97, who connects this passage with Enn. *Ann.* 78, the main point being that both twins are equal partners in rule.

111 Santini 1995:151 (commentary *ad loc.*) calls this interpretation a "lezione paleograficamente ammissibile", but makes no further comment; he prints *pararent*, as do all modern editions of Hemina.

of the story, then, Romulus and Remus seem to have had equal access to the Roman kingship.[112]

This interpretation is far from universally accepted. Among those who have rejected it, the arguments of Joachim Classen and Elizabeth Rawson have found the greatest favor.[113] Classen and Rawson agreed that Romulus and Remus probably ruled over the shepherds jointly before the foundation of the city; according to Rawson, this interpretation is preferable to "a true double kingship of the city (which would be very heretical)."[114] Thus, the Roman kingship was *not* shared, whereas the *possibility* of becoming a king was open to both twins. This matches the equal opportunity among competitors that we see in Ennius. Ver Eecke contested this, mildly; in the single paragraph she dedicated to Hemina, she stated that Remus rules with Romulus, but also that the evidence for this shared rule is limited to the twins' youth.[115] Beck and Walter saw Hemina's version as the opposite even of Ennius'; that Ennius includes a contest between the brothers already implies an agonistic context which is missing in Hemina.

Beck and Walter seem to me to be correct in what they say, but they do not go far enough. Hemina offers us the most unreservedly positive vision of the twins' deliberation over the foundation of the city, which is an even stronger statement of the importance of elite collegiality than that found in Ennius. In the *Annales*, as I argued above, such cooperation is problematized, but ultimately reaffirmed; in Hemina, it is simply reaffirmed by the twins' equal right to rule the city. Hemina's statement is reinforced by his politicized terminology (for example, *consensus* and *aequaliter*), and by the crowd willingly giving up power to the two young leaders. The association of the twins and politicized competition that we see in Ennius is also present in Hemina. In the commentary on this fragment from *FRHist*, John Briscoe pointed out that Livy uses *inter se comparare* in reference to consular *provinciae*. The similar phrase in

112 This is the opinion of e.g. Richard 1992 and von Ungern-Sternberg 1993; the latter stresses the importance of equal partnership throughout the foundation legend. Wiseman 1995a:76 argues that "the [foundation] story seems to have begun with both twins as founders of the city." Chassignet 1996:100n1 (commentary *ad loc.*) does not choose sides, although she does consider the passage as a whole to allude to the *comparatio* (*ibid.* n. 2).

113 Classen 1963:455n40a, although he admitted in the main text that such a scenario is "vorstellbar", and nowhere did he suggest a reason for the unlikelihood of a joint rule; Rawson 1991 (supported by e.g. Wiseman 1995a:5–6).

114 Rawson 1991:254; followed by *FRHist ad loc.* [Briscoe], for the same reasons.

115 ver Eecke 2008:196–7.

Hemina may also have been "normally used in this context."[116] If so, Hemina offers a close parallel to Jocelyn's understanding of Ennius (discussed above), and the two fragments together strongly suggest that Romulus and Remus offered a model for magisterial competition in the second century. This model stressed the importance of collegiality and collaboration for Rome's success, but required that the competition be fair.

We know extremely little about Hemina's social context. It is possible that Hemina was fairly close to the elite Cassii of his day, in particular the consul of 171, Cassius Longinus.[117] If so, his emphasis on the importance of collegiality may be no more than a reiteration of the values of his class. Given the exiguous remains of his history, however, it is dangerous to speculate even that far.

Hemina's date of composition is also uncertain, which makes it difficult to set his work in a broader context. Two slightly different possibilities for this date have been proposed, with differing significance for understanding his account of the foundation. Because Hemina refers to a *posterior* Punic War, he is usually considered to have completed his history prior to the outbreak of the third Punic War.[118] Carlo Santini, following a traditional interpretation of Pliny, placed his *floruit* in the mid-second century BCE, which makes Hemina one of the earliest Latin prose historians.[119] If this date is maintained, Hemina's cultural context is similar to Ennius'. The lack of conflict that we see in his history can be understood as reinforcing the value of collegiality that is enshrined in the Republican system. This message, coming at the end of the second Punic War, may also represent a cautionary reaction to the exceptional powers accrued by men such as Scipio or Fabius Maximus, and increasingly by generals in the expanding empire. An account such as Hemina's offers a corrective to this imbalance of power by emphasizing traditional behavior even at the foundation, when it was perhaps unnecessary.

116 *FRHist* III.167, further noting that "Hemina saw Romulus and Remus prefiguring the collegial nature of the consulship." There is another parallel at Cic. *Fam.* 1.10.25. Other poetic aspects of Hemina's account pointed out by Briscoe reinforce my argument that Hemina had Ennian or an Ennius-like account in mind: compare, for example, Hemina's *sine contentione consentiendo* with the Ennius *curantes magna cum cura.*

117 See e.g. Santini 1995:23–7, with bibliography; Suerbaum 2002:419. For the consul, see *MRR* I.416 and I.449.

118 Hemina (*FRHist* 6 F32 = 34 Chassignet = 34 B-W = 31 P = 33 Santini; see also *FRHist* 6 F40 = 42 Chassignet = 42 B-W = 39 P = 41 Santini); Forsythe 1990:327–8, Chassignet 1996:ix–xvi and *FRHist* I:219–23, all with further bibliography.

119 Pliny *NH* 36.107; Santini 1995:11–19, with further bibliography.

Gary Forsythe has argued, however, that Hemina in actuality may still have been working on his history much later, possibly even as late as the 120s.[120] This perspective is cautiously echoed by Beck and Walter, who take no stance but note that there is Gracchan influence in the fragments.[121] If this were in fact the case, Hemina's account of Romulus and Remus may have been influenced by the activities of the Gracchi. This is necessarily a speculative suggestion, both because the dating of Hemina's history is not clear and because little is known about Hemina himself: statements about his political ideology, for example, require extreme caution.[122] But if Hemina did indeed continue writing down to the 120s, the turbulent Gracchan period seems likely to have drawn his attention; it may have influenced his choices when he came to depict the foundation. The founding moment of a city sets the tone for its later actions.[123] The collegiality of the twins still reflects Republican ideals, but the choice to emphasize those ideals has a different nuance at this period of internal strife than in the 150s.

Although the exact date of Hemina's text is not certain, the second century as a whole saw numerous instances of generals with more power than was ideal.[124] That this fragment of Hemina stresses the collaborative relationship between the twins, rather than their rivalry, remains indisputable, even if we retain the traditional dating of his history. This cooperation is likely to reveal Hemina's concern for consensus over extremism. My interpretation thus reveals a glimpse into the political views of a little-known writer.

Hemina's evidence, like that of Ennius, suggests that the story of the foundation could be viewed as a positive moral lesson. This observation, though it may seem obvious, has not been universally accepted. Hemina's version, which is admittedly very fragmentary, may not have included even the productive

---

120 Forsythe 1990:333. This dating is rejected by Chassignet 1996:ix–x and Briscoe (*FRHist* I:220–21), and considered possible but not likely by Santini 1995:11–21, esp. p. 20. See also Suerbaum 2002:418–21, who retains the traditional dating, calling Hemina the earliest annalist except perhaps Piso; Walter 2004:303 takes no position, merely placing Hemina between Cato and Piso.

121 See Beck-Walter 2005:242; 262–3 (commentary *ad loc.*). This is disputed by Briscoe (e.g., *FRHist* I:221, on the crucial question of *posterior*: "there is no example of *posterior* being used to refer to the second in a series of more than two" anywhere in the *TLL*); at the same time, there are clear references in Hemina's work to events after 149 (p. 222).

122 Cf. Forsythe 1990:326; Santini 1995:11–29; Beck-Walter 2001 [2005]:242.

123 See e.g. Calame 2003.

124 For example, Flamininus with his three-day triumph (see Livy 45.28); on the fundamentally transgressive nature of Republican triumphs, see Hölscher 2004a. On Flamininus' independent actions, see e.g. Eckstein 1987:274–7.

rivalry seen in Ennius. Instead, I have argued that he presents a wholesome picture of cooperation that offered a didactic message for his own day.

Conclusion

Previous scholarship on Ennius and Cassius Hemina has noted some differences between the fragments of their works and surviving later sources. Nonetheless, the main features of the 'vulgate' tradition are generally believed to have been present in the second-century authors as well. I have argued that this is not the case; there are in fact significant differences of emphasis between the narratives of Ennius and Hemina on the one hand, and those of the late Republic on the other. In the Ennian account of the foundation story, Romulus and Remus are equals, and their similar status is reinforced by the balance accorded to them at the contest over the foundation. Their competition is a healthy one: each is striving for the good of the city, rather than solely aiming to become king.

Although we do not know how this story ended in Ennius, we can speculate (although it must remain speculation) that Remus did not die at Romulus' hand. This would allow for a more favorable depiction of Romulus throughout the poem, one that is more appropriate for epic celebration of the founder of a great city. We know from the fragments that Romulus is deified; it would make sense that this honor is granted because he worked hard to make Rome a success.[125] Although a king, Romulus was a model for the Republic to come. Such exemplary behavior can be seen more clearly in the account of Cassius Hemina, and may help explain the discrepancy seen by many scholars between Romulus as the city's founder and Romulus as a fratricide. The positive spin of these legends reinforced the potentially productive aims of elite ambition, rather than their potentially negative consequences. This positive emphasis wanes over the course of the first century. The negative depiction of the twins' relationship came only later, in a different cultural context.

125 This interpretation is implied by Cic. *DRP* 2.17–20, but there is no guarantee that this passage was inspired by Ennius.

CHAPTER 3

Invective

The years 70–50, for modern historians as well as some contemporary observers, marked the last hurrah of the Republican system. The story of the twins underwent fewer changes in this period. In both Ennius and Cassius Hemina, as we saw, the twins are equals and provide a positive model for the Roman elite. By the triumviral period, their story has become a far more negative one: Remus is killed, and Romulus is to blame. Just as importantly, our surviving evidence from the late Republic focuses almost solely on Romulus; the twins' collaborative actions were set aside. This suggests an increasingly bleak outlook, although the majority of evidence that survives displays a neutral view towards Romulus. He, like his brother, stands in for 'Romans' in general in Catullus; he is a just king in Cicero. The worst Romulus that we see is an upstart, a *novus* who populated his community with low-status citizens.

By the 40s, the characterization of Romulus becomes more negative. The experience of civil war may have encouraged Roman authors to re-examine their foundation legend and to question the positive value of competition. Instead of benefitting the city, rivalry appears as harmful, indicating a problem with the status quo among the Roman elite. It is at this point that the Romulus legend became pointedly "good to think with", as the authors of this period saw their ancestral culture devolving into chaos.

The late first century also marks Romulus' descent into a villain, or at least a poor *exemplum* for contemporary Romans. This may be a response to the increasing frequency and power of individual leaders. For writers supportive of traditional ideals, the isolation of power into the hands of a few individuals could not be tolerated. In such a system, Republican competition becomes unfair, because only those close to the leaders are able to succeed. Such a situation is close to tyranny, and Romulus, as the founder of the city and model for its elite, appears as a tyrant for the first time. The foundation becomes an expression of political crisis: the imbalance created between collegiality and ambition escalates to political disaster.

Some authors may have seen similar disaster around them. The events of this era were turbulent and signified many breaks with earlier traditions of leadership. At the beginning of the second century and in response to the irregularities of office-holding during the second Punic War, the *lex Villia annalis* of 180 had set up specific minimum ages for the tenure of political office and specified a two-year interval between an individual's possession of the same

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_005

magistracy.[1] This act in effect set up a regular political system, perhaps in response to certain individuals or families dominating the government.

In the late second century, soon after the Gracchi and Hemina, this brief period of order changed. In hindsight, many of these changes can be attributed to the reforms of the army, at least in part:[2] from this point forward, having a large military force was almost a prerequisite for making a significant political impact in Rome. Reliance on the army, in turn, led to repeated consulships or lengthy assignments of *imperium* to individual generals. This both lessened the field of competition and posed a potential threat to the safety of the Republic. For example, Marius' continuous tenure of the consulship from 104 to 100 drastically narrowed the field of competition for this highly sought-after office for five years, frustrating the ambitions of twice as many men.[3] The fact that he was re-elected *in absentia* in 105 broke even more sharply with tradition: he essentially gained a five-year stretch in the highest office without trying.[4] Some of the distress that this caused is reflected in the subsequent Sullan legislation that applied restrictions on office-holding even more stringently than before.[5]

The offense caused by Marius' electoral irregularity was compounded when his ally, the tribune of the plebs Saturninus, attached a rider to legislation about settling veterans. This required the senators to swear an oath of obedience to the law.[6] The required oath proved uncomfortably close to swearing loyalty to Marius himself, and far too similar to the imposition of military discipline upon the senators. Metellus Numidicus, an eminent senator and

1 See e.g. *CAH*^{2}, vol. 8, chapter 6 [Astin]; Astin 1958 stresses the custom of waiting between magistracies even before it was made law; Develin 1979, but esp. pp. 29–30 and 80–4 (on the increase in competition in the late third century and the continuities and differences between the eras before and after the second Punic War); Beck 2005:51–61 (on the *lex Villia*) and 97–101 (useful data on iteration before and after its implementation); Stewart 1998:59, with n. 13–14. In contrast, see e.g. Feig Vishnia 1996:52–4 for a discussion of the irregularities in office-holding during the second Punic War; Beck 2005 for a discussion of these irregularities in the middle Republic in general.

2 See e.g. *CAH*^{2}, vol. 9, chapter 2 [Lintott]; Crawford 1993:125–30; Scullard 2010:42, the change in recruitment practice "had far-reaching political effects and paved the way for the later military dictatorships."

3 See *MRR* s.v.

4 See *MRR* s.v.; also Mackay 2004:118.

5 The dates for the various parts of Sulla's legislation are disputed, but all reforms occurred between his return to Rome in 83 and his retirement from the dictatorship in either 80 or 79. For further discussion, see e.g. Hinard 2008:50–5; Keaveney 2005; *CAH*^{2} vol. 9, chapter 6 [Seager].

6 In 100 BCE; see e.g. *CAH*^{2}, vol. 9, chapter 3 [Lintott]; Scullard 2010:50, with bibliography; the ancient sources are Plut. *Mar*. 29.1; App. *BC* 1.30–3.

Marius' former ally, went into exile because of his refusal to carry out the law's provisions. This episode indicates some discomfort with the contemporary use of power in Rome. The oath posed a threat to senatorial independence and set a potentially dangerous precedent. Saturninus' position as a tribune and three-year tenure of office was reminiscent of the Gracchi and tyranny; by associating himself with Marius and his armies, he perhaps seemed ready to seize the city by coup.[7] Marius' attempts to disengage from Saturninus were ultimately unsuccessful; charged with his former ally's murder, he fled Rome for the next several years. His return during the Social War sparked competition with the consul-elect Sulla, whose allotted *provincia* was the war against Mithridates—a command that Marius allegedly wanted for himself.

Sulla's response showed that he was an even greater threat: by marching against the city of Rome itself on two occasions, first in 88 and then in 83, he unintentionally set the pattern for the next half-century of conflicts. The initial Sullan march on Rome was imitated by Marius and Cinna a year later, a period that later generations remembered as a bloodbath.[8] The conflict between Marius and Sulla did not even end after both were dead; Marius' former commander Sertorius fought Roman forces in Spain until the late 70s.

Such lasting turmoil indicates that the tenure of political power at Rome had become a tense issue. Ver Eecke has recently argued that the Sullan period saw two changes in the recounting of the foundation legend: the evolution of Romulus from *conditor* to *rex* and the political use of Romulus as a system of opposed propaganda between factions ('romulisme' and 'anti-romulisme').[9] Her argument is important, and I agree that there is a change between the second-century and first-century accounts of the founder. Because I engage with ver Eecke's argument at some length, I will quickly summarize what seem to me its most important details (with the caveat that parts of her argument, such as the use of Romulus in foreign policy, are omitted).

---

7 For the violence in the city under tribunes like Saturninus and the Gracchi, see Lintott 1968.

8 Sulla's marches on Rome: Plut. *Sulla* 9.3–7 and 28.4–33.1; App. *BC* 1.55–60. Marius' march on Rome: Plut. *Mar.* 42.2–44.6; App. *BC* 1.62–74, esp. 71. For Sulla, see the various works of François Hinard (many of his positions are conveniently summarized in Hinard 2008) and, more apologetic, Arthur Keaveney (e.g., Keaveney 1982 and 2005). For Cinna, see e.g. Lovano 2002, generous but with a broad discussion of earlier scholarship. Marius has inspired less recent literature. For the period as a whole, see in general *CAH*^{2} vol. 9 s.v. Marius; Sulla merits his own chapter.

9 ver Eecke 2008. The factionalist view of Roman history, once quite popular, no longer holds up to scrutiny. For the traditional view, see e.g. Scullard 1973 and, more recently, Wiseman 2009b:14–15. Arena 2012:7–8, while more nuanced than 'parties', still suggests two opposing "ideological systems". *Contra*, Gruen 1974; Robb 2010, with full bibliography.

Ver Eecke's main aim is to trace the varying accounts of Romulus through the Republic using all available source material. She identifies two loci of change in the narrative: one regional, between those who approve of Rome and those who do not; and one temporal, in the Sullan period and later. The latter change is not specific to Sulla, but to many great men of his era, and is spurred by the leaders themselves. In order to improve their position in Rome, such men equate themselves with Romulus as new founders. Speaking of the Sallustian speech of Lepidus, for example, she argues that this represents

> la projection rétrospective des attaques anti-syllaniennes de Lépide, qui aurait ainsi, par ce parallèle négatif, répondu au romulisme et au servianisme de Sylla. La conflit suscité par la question de ses funérailles a donné lieu, selon nous,. . . . à la première manifestation romaine de l'anti-romulisme, utilisation négative de l'image de Romulus.[10]

According to this argument, Romulus played an increasing role in both the external and the internal political discourse of the Marian and Sullan period. Ver Eecke is fairly cautious about her need to use later sources for the Marian period, and observes that most descriptions of Marius' activities are due to the rosy pictures given by Cicero and Caesar or a now-lost hostile tradition, represented by Plutarch.[11] For example, Plutarch's description of Marius as a 'third Romulus' is unlikely to be contemporary.[12] But for less prominent figures, ver Eecke is more trusting of later evidence, using the combination of Plutarch and the *Fasti Praenestini* to argue for Catulus' association of himself with Romulus.[13] Plutarch's claim to have read Sulla's *commentarii* lead her to argue that he is an accurate source for Catulus as well.[14]

The Sullan period is more richly represented, although again solely by later sources. Ver Eecke here uses the Sallustian speech of Lepidus (discussed below) and evidence from Suetonius' biography of Caesar to reconstruct a contemporary hostile tradition about Sulla.[15] This tradition, which she argues is colored by *optimas*/*popularis* struggles and the motif of the tyrant, leads to

---

10 ver Eecke 2008:190.

11 ver Eecke 2008:104–9; 118–21 on Cicero.

12 Plut. *Mar.* 27.9; ver Eecke 2008:107–8.

13 Plut. *Mar*. 26.3; *I. Ital.* 13.2, pp. 123 and 429; ver Eecke 2008:111–16.

14 Plut. *Sulla* 25.8, 26.5, and 26.10; ver Eecke 2008:113.

15 Sall. *Hist*. 1.55.5M; read with Suet. *DJ* 77.1, this paints Sulla as a 'bad Caesar'. See ver Eecke 2008:186.

the depiction of Sulla as a new Romulus on the part of the optimates.[16] This is not absent from Sulla's own self-presentation, as is clear from his use of augural symbolism;[17] however, she argues that the depiction of Romulus at this point becomes an object of political debate, with the *populares* following the tyrannical line and the *optimates* presenting Sulla/Romulus as a founder. This change, she argues, is particularly clear at the time of Sulla's funeral; the question of whether he should be denied burial because of his tyranny assimilates him strongly to the negative depiction of Romulus seen in Livy.[18] But Sulla's funeral is also exactly the place where Plutarch's account, the only one which professes contemporary authority, loses its greatest claim to credibility, the contemporary *commentarii* of Sulla himself. As I will argue in this chapter, the strongly marked negative use of Romulus can be traced back to precisely the era of our sources Sallust and Livy, rather than that of Sulla himself.

While I agree with ver Eecke that Romulus is a useful political tool because of his identity as the original Roman, the surviving material from this period cannot support her more specific claims. Direct responses to these events are now almost entirely lost to us, and the majority of her argument hangs on the much later evidence of Plutarch and Appian.[19] But these sources must be used with great caution, as both Plutarch and Appian wrote their accounts of this period with full knowledge that the Republic had ended and of how this end had occurred. At least some of their evidence is colored by later events, in particular the civil war between Caesar and Pompey and Caesar's later assassination. It cannot be used as an indication of how Romulus was understood in the late second and early first centuries, and in particular it cannot be used to date a change in this understanding specifically to the Sullan era.

The vast loss of contemporary evidence cannot be helped: although later writers preserve some earlier sources, the brevity of these accounts often provide little information. When these sources are preserved, their start and end points are not demarcated; moreover, the extent of paraphrasing and summarizing is likely to be considerable. Even when we have a fairly explicit reference to (for example) Licinius Macer, we cannot assume that this reference

16 ver Eecke 2008:176–81. On the Roman language of tyranny, see Dunkle 1967.

17 ver Eecke 2008:181; cf. Keaveney 2005 on Sulla as augur.

18 ver Eecke 2008:190–3 in particular. Tyrant: e.g. App. *BC* 1.101, Plut. *Sulla* 38.1–6, Livy 1.49.1 (on the death of Tarquinius Superbus). Founder: cf. the funerals of Numa (Plut. *Numa* 22) and Publicola (Cic. *Leg*. 2.58).

19 See ver Eecke 2008:8, "nous examinerons également les plus anciens témoinages ... ainsi que ceux des auteurs d'époques impériale et byzantine." As I discussed in the first chapter, I am hesitant to use these later sources as evidence for the Republic.

preserves an accurate picture of Macer's work; this opinion may represent only one of several possible variants that his full work offered. The narrative arc and overall argument of these works is unknown, and drawing conclusions about their nature or the specific words they use in their texts is risky.

The dearth of source material makes an investigation of the discourses of this period close to impossible. Starting in the mid-first century, however, the literary discussion of the twins—or at least Romulus—picks up again. This discussion may provide insight into the changes that occurred in the early first century; it certainly suggests a change in perspective about the founders. The message of productive rivalry has either disappeared or, in one of the several options proferred by Dionysius, become perverted into civil strife.

The mid-first century, like its beginning, was marked by a nearly constant struggle for dominance. The sources I deal with here are, for the most part, aware of the struggle between Pompey and Caesar in the late 50s, culminating in the civil war of 49. At this period, rivalry was not productive; it was disastrous. When men possessing extensive powers vied with one another, it led to civil discord; such men failed to reconcile for the good of the state, as had Fulvius and Aemilius more than a century earlier.

This chapter surveys a well-represented period of time, from the mid-first century to the beginning of the triumviral period. I argue that there is a distinct change for the worse in these later accounts of Romulus and Remus: the twins' rivalry no longer has a positive impact on the state, but rather is a source of evil to Rome. The unproblematic transition from rivalry between two contenders to the dominance of one has become a locus of trouble by the 40s, at the latest; I suggest that this is due to the similarity of this narrative pattern to the recent struggle between Pompey and Caesar, as well as the previous decades of civil strife in Rome. These stories then meld together, so that as time passes Pompey and Caesar are remembered as more similar to Romulus and Remus, but also to Marius and Sulla; likewise, Romulus and Remus assimilate to men like Caesar and Pompey.[20] Our histories then come to 'repeat themselves' in order to draw more persuasive analogues and better lessons.

Because I argue that the changes in the tradition are due to contemporary and recent politics, I also examine how contemporary witnesses discuss the political tensions of their own day. Our chief informant in this regard is, of course, Cicero, whose writings dominate the evidence from the 50s and 40s. I attempt to mitigate this dominance as much as possible by drawing parallels from other contemporary sources and from the later accounts of the triumviral period; my aim in this regard is to show not that Cicero represents the

20 For this process in familial legends, see Richardson 2012.

opinion of 'the Romans', but rather that his opinion was not an isolated one. I also include a brief discussion of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus as repositories of earlier sources; their histories will be taken up again, this time in their own right, in the next chapter.

Romulus and Republican Politics

In the late Republic, Romulus' name was used in political debate. This is often seen as a disapproving use of the founder's image and evidence that he had, by this period, achieved the status of tyrant. A closer look at these occasions makes the use of the founder's name less unequivocal, and suggests a profound ambiguity, rather than disapproval, in reference to Romulus. The fact that Remus is absent from political debate also suggests that the use of Romulus' name alone had no unfavorable connotation at this time. In effect, there were three ways to use Romulus' name: as a blanket term for any Roman; as a metonym for a good king; and as a marker of a tyrant. All of these uses appear in surviving works from the mid-first century BCE.

Thus even outside of the glorifying context of a national epic, Romulus was not necessarily a negative figure. He could be used negatively in political debate, and I will suggest that this unfavorable portrayal became common in the 40s. At this period, however, Romulus rarely appeared in an extended narrative account. This means that his interactions with others are largely ignored. He is never connected to Remus or Titus Tatius, even when those relationships are relevant to the argument being made. In political discourse of the 40s, Remus initially seems to be left out. But he cannot be forgotten; the twins are connected in Roman thought, as is clear from the phrase *de Remo et Romulo*.[21] The very absence of Remus underscores the lack of collegiality inherent in kingship. But Rome had a history of good as well as bad kings, and rulership in itself was not enough to make Romulus into a bad moral lesson. In the more complete works we have from the first century, Romulus' name works on multiple levels to trigger associations of kingship, of fraternal behavior, and of the foundation.

That Romulus could be seen as a tyrant by the late first century is clear from the evidence of Livy, writing in the late 30s or early 20s, and the Augustan-era Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[22] Although the consistently negative interpre-

---

21 Cic. *Leg.* 1.8, with Dyck's (2004) commentary *ad loc.*

22 See e.g. Livy 1.15.8 and 1.16.4 (Romulus was liked by the people more than by the senate, who killed him, and had a bodyguard—important characteristics of a tyrant) and

tation of Romulus has been emphasized by some scholars,[23] this tyrannical posture has also been seen as a late development of the Romulus legend, probably dating to the second century.[24] Several reasons for this have been offered. Emilio Gabba has suggested that Dionysius' primary interest lay in the society of the Augustan era, although he used sources that perhaps date back to the Sullan period.[25] A Sullan-era change has frequently been suggested for Latin-language sources as well. C. J. Classen argued that the development of the tyrannical Romulus in this era was due to both the rationalizing tendency of the first-century annalists and the use of Romulus in political propaganda.[26] Historians of the first century, on this argument, were less likely to explain the city's origins by reference to gods. If so, Romulus could not have been raised to the heavens by his father; instead, he was murdered. If he was murdered, there must have been a reason, and this reason is that he had become a tyrant. In contrast, H. J. Krämer thought that the Romulus story was negative from the start; the fratricide narrative, in his view, could only be hostile to Rome. Nonetheless, he saw Romulus as a tyrant in the Sullan era and during the later civil wars; it was only under Augustus that the founder became a positive figure.[27] Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg suggested that the tyrannical Romulus was a later development because Romulus was initially a culture hero, and the negative picture of tyranny is not compatible with that role.[28] He further suggested that this change may have been connected with the Social War and early attempts at rationalization, but also postulated that the change may have been very late, perhaps connected with Caesar's dictatorship.[29] Finally, ver Eecke, although she argued that the political use of Romulus was not always negative, nonetheless agreed that the major change in Romulus' depiction should be traced back to the early first century.[30]

This change, then, is usually located in the first century, and often attributed to Sulla. But the evidence for the first-century switch from Romulus the good

---

DH 2.56.3, τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκέτι βασιλικῶς ἀλλὰ τυραννικώτερον ἐξάγειν ("he ruled no longer like a king, but like a tyrant").

23 E.g., Krämer 1965:357; Jocelyn 1971:54–7.

24 See e.g. Ogilvie 1965:85; Gabba 1991:162–3 and 2000:31; Evans 1992:89–90; Edwards 1996:41n38. Poucet 1984:4n7 provides a full bibliography on changes in the figure of Romulus over time.

25 Gabba 1991:163–4, 205–13.

26 Classen 1962:179–89; the propagandistic use is taken from later sources.

27 Krämer 1965:383–6.

28 von Ungern-Sternberg 2006:67; cf. pp. 43–5.

29 von Ungern-Sternberg 2006:48–9 and 69.

30 ver Eecke 2008:222–39.

king to Romulus the tyrant is mostly late and is more ambiguous than is usually thought. Although previous scholarship has seen this change to Romulus' character as irrevocable, I argue that the choice to stress the tyrannical version of Romulus was made only in a very circumscribed era. For most of the period in question, the three possible uses of Romulus listed above remained in rotation.

Further, while previous scholarship has suggested that the Romulus we see in the first century represents a stark change to a previously positive Romulus legend, or conversely a strengthening of pre-existing anti-Romulean rhetoric, I argue that the situation was not so clear-cut. Instead, Romulus was a polyvalent figure, a status that does not change over time. Thus, when 'Romulus' must be understood unfavorably, his name is qualified with a negative adjective. This is visible in the mid-first century; for earlier writers, the argument from silence may have some weight. No mid-first century author argues for or against the tyrannical Romulus, and we can perhaps assume that this is because such a character was not standard at that time.

A public figure is called 'Romulus' on four occasions before the death of Caesar, according to our sources. Only once is this done by a contemporary, in Catullus' poem 29; the other examples appear in the pseudo-Sallustian invective against Cicero, Sallust's fragmentary speech of Lepidus in the *Histories*, and Plutarch's *Life of Pompey*. The Romulus who appears in these works is a more nuanced figure than previous scholarship has suggested. The effective use of Romulus in this period depends on him being seen not as a tyrant (an automatically negative term), but as a powerful Roman whose moral standing was left open.

Catullus

Catullus refers to a *cinaede Romule* in his poem 29, a figure that is usually understood to mean Caesar.[31] The primary voice of dissent in this interpretation remains Kenneth Quinn, who cautiously suggested that it may be Pompey instead.[32] Subsequent scholarship has argued that the reference is ambiguous.[33] In either case, the significance is similar. Catullus attacks a public figure for corruption and for consorting with the infamous Mamurra. The use of 'Romulus'

31 Cat. 29.5, 9; see e.g. Havas 2004; Bannon 1997:161.

32 Quinn 1970:176–7; see also Cameron 1976. Jocelyn 1999 argued that the reference is to a statue, not a politician.

33 E.g., Syndikus 1984:177–9; Ruiz Sánchez 1996:278–81, with full bibliography pp. 278–9n22.

here indicates the addressee's status as a leader: *cinaedus* is a sexual slur that heightens the abuse.[34] The connection with the founder of the city and the ambitions of either Pompey or Caesar is intriguing, but must be considered with caution. The poem is traditionally dated to the mid-50s, before Pompey's sole consulship and probably before the split between Pompey and Caesar (as implied by the last line).[35]

Quis hoc potest videre, quis potest pati,
nisi impudicus et vorax et aleo,
Mamurram habere quod Comata Gallia
habebat ante et ultima Britannia?
cinaede Romule, haec videbis et feres?
et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
perambulabit omnium cubilia,
ut albulus columbus aut Adoneus?
cinaede Romule, haec videbis et feres?
es impudicus et vorax et aleo.
eone nomine, imperator unice,
fuisti in ultima occidentis insula,
ut ista vestra diffututa mentula
ducenties comesset aut trecenties?
quid est alid sinistra liberalitas?
parum expatravit an parum elluatus est?
paterna prima lancinata sunt bona,
secunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia
Hibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus:
nunc Galliae timetur et Britanniae.
quid hunc malum fovetis? aut quid hic potest
nisi uncta devorare patrimonia?
eone nomine, urbis o piissimi
socer generque, perdidistis omnia?[36]

34 See e.g. Skinner 1979 and 1993; Jocelyn 1999; Williams 2009:191–202.

35 Cat. 29.24, *socer generque*, referring to the marriage of Pompey and Caesar's daughter Julia (for which see e.g. Cic. *Att.* 2.17.1; Suet. *DJ* 21). For the date, see e.g. McDermott 1983:299 (55/4; however, the reference to Spain strongly supports a date after Pompey's consulship in 55) and Thomson 1997:278 (53, after Pompey's remarriage).

36 Cat. 29, "What man, unless he is a shameless and greedy gambler, can suffer or allow this—that Mamurra holds what Transalpine Gaul and far-off Britain had before? Romulus, you pervert, can you see this and bear it? And now will he make the circuit of

The poem can be divided into two parts, of which the first (1–11) seems to be directed at Pompey; it is in this section that both references to Romulus occur. But the main addressee, Mamurra, implies a closer connection with Caesar.[37] Ver Eecke thinks that poem 57, addressed to both Caesar and Mamurra as *cinaedi* and *gemelli*, secures this identification.[38] Yet because *cinaedus* is used elsewhere in the Catullan corpus to refer to other men, the identification cannot be assured.[39] Hans Peter Syndikus, moreover, sees poem 57's emphasis on the equation of Caesar and Mamurra as a means of insulting Caesar, which seems to disqualify it as a reference to poem 29.[40] It is safer to follow Marcos Ruiz Sánchez, who suggests that we not identify this Romulus with a single person; the strict and hostile identification of 'Romulus' with a single subject "nos parece ... ignorar los leyes del género al que pertenecen."[41] The poem need not be a reaction to a specific slight, but a general statement: 'Romulus' is any leading man who would side with the greedy Mamurra and his supporters.

Regardless of our identification of this Romulus, the interpretation would be much the same: a contemporary political figure with a great deal of clout was being called 'Romulus' in an abusive manner. Moreover, while the coupling of Romulus with a term of abuse is unparalleled in the corpus of poems, Catullus elsewhere uses him metonymically to mean 'Roman'. In fact, the

---

everyone's bedroom, supremely proud, like a pure-white dove or Adonis? Romulus, you pervert, you see this and you will bear it? *You* are a shameless and greedy gambler. On this account, sole commander, were you in the distant island of the west—so that your worn-out pricks could consume two or three hundred? What is this if not backwards generosity? Did he squander a little or was he squandered a little? The first property he wasted was his inheritance; then the Pontic booty; after that the Spanish loot, which the gold-bearing river Tagus can vouch for. So one ought to fear for Gaul and Britain. Why do you support this wretched man? What can he do except consume luscious patrimonies? Most dutiful father-in-law and son-in-law in the city, would you destroy everything on this man's account?" (I have translated Goold's text.)

37 As perhaps does the term *cinaedus*: a reference to youthful exploits with Nicomedes of Bithynia? See Suet. *DJ* 49, Dio 43.20.4, and the rebuttal of this affair by Osgood 2008.

38 The term is a 'cross-reference'; see ver Eecke 2008:370–3 (quotation on p. 371). See also McDermott 299–304 for the similarities between the two poems.

39 E.g., Furius in poem 16; Thallus in poem 25; Vibennus in poem 33. McDermott 1983:303 agrees that "the address *cinaede Romule* in 29 would be so general that it would probably not have offended" Caesar.

40 Syndikus 1984:278 for the significance of *gemelli*; he himself voices no opinion on this poem's connection with poem 29.

41 Ruiz Sánchez 1996:284.

names ‘Romulus’ and ‘Remus’ can be used interchangeably for this purpose.[42] This is important in itself, for it indicates that Catullus, at least, saw the twins as equals who can be called upon as substitutes for one another.

That the twins have roughly the same weight has not been accepted by all modern scholarship. Marilyn Skinner, for example, saw Remus as a symbol of the upper classes; Wiseman, in contrast, argued that he symbolizes the plebeians in contrast to the patrician Romulus.[43] Such a separation seems to me more rigid than is justified by the Catullan evidence. Instead, Catullus, much like Ennius, treated the twins evenhandedly. Such evenhandedness also implies not only that Remus was still an important figure, but also that Romulus was not at this point automatically viewed as a tyrant or negative paradigm of leadership. Instead, like Remus, his name was a personalized synonym for the abstract *Romanus*. This further suggests that there was no change in Romulus’ character in the Sullan era; if there had been, Catullus could not have expected his audience to understand ‘Romulus’ as ‘Roman’ without further explanation. As a polysemous character, Romulus could be exploited with greater flexibility.

That Catullus used Romulus and Remus interchangeably indicates that at this stage, neither twin had a distinct character type (e.g., ‘good’ or ‘tyrannical’). This usage, the sole contemporary evidence we have for the use of Romulus’ name in the political discourse of the 50s, supports my argument for the polyvalence of the founder at this time.

Sallust, [*Sallust*]*, and Cicero*

The other three instances (Sallust, [Sallust], and the Plutarchian *Life of Pompey*) of the potentially polemic use of ‘Romulus’ occur in authors writing after the events that they describe—sometimes long after. As a result, these examples cannot be taken as direct evidence for speech in the Republic, although they do indicate how later generations perceived Romulus. In the

42 Catullus refers to Cicero as *dissertissime Romuli nepotum* in poem 49; cp. poems 58.5, *magnanimi Remi nepotes* (where Remus’ name may be used for the meter) and 28.15, *opprobria Romuli Remique.* For the interpretation of all of these passages as simply ‘Romans’, see e.g. Thomson 1997:278; Deuling 1999:190; ver Eecke 2008:372. Jocelyn 1999:104 argues that ‘Romulus’ cannot be a “typical or representative Roman citizen,” but only an exceptional one; this does not affect my argument, which deals only with the most powerful Romans.

43 Skinner 1991, with some bibliography; Wiseman 1995a. All of the identifiable Romans in Catullus are elite, although not all are patrician.

cases that we have, being a 'Romulus' is marked as bad through the use of a qualifier. This implies that 'Romulus' on its own may not have been. Moreover, these cases do not provide evidence that Romulus the tyrant was as yet the dominant characterization of Romulus, although it is clear that Romulus was perceived as a king. In other words, the act of calling a public figure 'Romulus' does not seem to have had the same effect as *tyrannus*.

Particularly suspect is the pseudo-Sallustian invective against Cicero, in which the orator is called *Romule Arpinas*.[44] This may echo the actual Sallustian tag from the *Histories*, in which the consul Lepidus calls Sulla *scaevus iste Romulus*.[45] Yet even this reference, securely dated to the period of the second triumvirate, is ambiguous. Sulla is marked out here as a *scaevus* Romulus; this seems to imply that Romulus himself is a polyvalent figure. Otherwise, the adjective is unnecessary: if being a Romulus were in itself enough to mark someone out as a villain, there would be no need to reiterate his evil nature. The neutral semantics of Romulus' name on its own here, as in Catullus, continue the equalizing second-century use of Romulus and Remus for which I argued above.

Ver Eecke has made a strong case against the traditional view. She argues that the Romulus we see in Sallust is a positive figure, and that the adjective is ironic. In this speech, *scaevus* has a double meaning, both 'perverse' and 'ill-omened'.[46] She further suggests, following R. Reggiani, that *scaevus* Romulus is meant as a contrast to Sulla's self-depiction as *felix*, a contrast underlined by Sulla's own self-presentation as a new *conditor*.[47] This second argument is quite attractive, although it need not imply that Romulus is a figure to be imitated. Because we have no instances where Romulus is used on his own with a clearly favorable value, the name's ethical quality may still be ambiguous in

44 [Sall.] *In Cic.* 7, "Romulus of Arpinum"; the full quote reads *oro te, Romule Arpinas, qui egregia tua virtute omnis Paulos, Fabios, Scipiones superasti, quem tandem locum in hac civitate obtines?* ("I ask you, Romulus of Arpinum, who have surpassed all the Pauli, all the Fabii, all the Scipiones in your outstanding virtue, what place do you have in *this* city [i.e., Rome]?"). The attribution of this invective to Sallust is still hotly disputed; see e.g. Novokhatko 2009:111–29, a full summary of the debate (Novokhatko herself thinks it is spurious, p. 129). This line is quoted by Quintilian *IO* 9.3.2, which provides a *terminus ante quem* of the late first century CE. Cicero implicitly identifies himself with Romulus in *Cat.* 3.2 (on which see below, p. 68–69). See further Novokhatko 2009:161n52.

45 Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.5 M, "that perverse Romulus." See Paladini 1967:80, McGushin 1992:113, Reggiani 1994, and Bannon 1997:161n68 for the traditional readings.

46 ver Eecke 2008:183–6.

47 Reggiani 1994:217–19, ver Eecke 2008:126–9 and 184–5; cf. Santangelo 2007:195–223 on Sulla *felix*.

this case.[48] The speech of Lepidus, then, leaves the question of Romulus up in the air. This ambiguity is quite different from the significance of the name later on: in the 40s, as we will see below, using the name 'Romulus' on its own is a condemnation.

Returning to the invective against Cicero, where Romulus' name is used as a term of abuse, we again have the problem of the qualifying adjective. Cicero is called, essentially, a 'small-time Romulus'. This implies not necessarily that he is tyrannical or a murderer (although both charges could be made against Cicero), but perhaps that he is overconfident. It mocks Cicero's self-identification with the founder, seen in his post-reditum speeches in particular. If Cicero is to be a founder, it is not the founder of *Rome*, but of a distant and less powerful city.

Moreover, the invective attacks Cicero in a weak area: his hometown. In the full account, Cicero is mocked for his lack of influence at Rome, despite his attempts to associate himself with the city's leading families in his rhetoric. As a new man from outside of Rome, Cicero was sensitive about his origins and made a point of connecting himself with Marius, who was also from Arpinum and whose great deeds for the Republic were well known.[49] In this regard, it is significant that Cicero himself never calls Marius a founder or 'Romulus'.[50] These names became a later part of the Marian tradition, but do not seem to be part of that tradition in the mid-first century. Cicero neither defends Marius from attack as a 'Romulus' not praises him as one; even his poem on Marius' consulship, quoted directly before the Ennian augury scene in *de Divinatione*, shows few connections to the city founder. There are no significant textual similarities between the two excerpts, and aside from the successful augury, no shared themes.[51] Unlike Augustus with his twelve vultures, Cicero's Marius is

48 The manuscript reading, *saevus ille Romulus* (see Serv. *Ecl.* 3.13.), is in fact more negative, as it implies that being a Romulus is in some way bad, rather than being a fake Romulus. As Paladini points out, however, *saevus* does not make sense in the context of the quotation: "l'errore è evidente, ché a chiosare *perversus* ben conviene *scaevus*, non *saevus*" (Paladini 1967:80).

49 Cf. e.g. Cic. *Div.* 1.106, where Cicero's poem on Marius is quoted. Cicero does refer to Marius as *pater patriae*, a term that he will also use to associate himself with salvation and foundation: see *Pro Rab.* 27 and Cole 2013:49–51.

50 See e.g. Weinstock 1971:177–80, with references; Alföldi 1971:29 with references for later historians. Münzer suggested that the trend starts with Sulla (*RE* 7.338–9), not Marius.

51 Words such as *caelum* are repeated, but this seems necessary due to narrative context; the avoidance of all words in the Ennian fragment could also be significant, but that is not what we have here.

no second Romulus.[52] Instead, Cicero uses similar terms for Marius as he uses for himself, and emphasizes the salvation of the city rather than its foundation.

Moreover, through his identification with Romulus, Cicero sets up a clear distinction and hierarchy of honors. Regal honors and tyranny are separate from the divine honors that accrue to a founder, and the latter are acceptable to Cicero.[53] This separation at least partially vindicates Romulus as a ruler, and also helps illustrate why quasi-divine honors were permissible in a Republican setting.

Cicero was proud to have saved the city from the Catilinarians, and this becomes part of his self-fashioning in 63 and beyond. But while he refers to both himself and Romulus in this regard, it is clear that his role as a savior of the city is secondary to Romulus' as a founder. This is only made explicit once, in the third *Catilinarian*, although Cicero elsewhere refers to his achievement of saving the city. In this speech, Cicero starts with a reminder of the danger that Catiline threatened to impose on the city; then he notes,

> quoniam illum, qui hanc urbem condidit, ad deos immortalis benevolentia famaque sustulimus, esse apud vos posterosque vestros in honore debebit is, qui eandem hanc urbem conditam amplificatamque servavit.[54]

This section sets up a parallel between Romulus and the implied role of Cicero.[55] *Qui ... condidit* corresponds to *qui ... servavit*, the founder with the savior. The honor accruing to the founder is apotheosis (*ad deos ... sustulimus*), while Cicero's reward is quite different. He seeks immortality in the form of memory and earthly honors, rather than actual cult.[56] This is not likely to be a

52 See e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 95.

53 As seen in Cic. *DRP* 2.17–20. See Büchner 1984:179 (on 2.10) for the significance of *divinus* in the context of foundation, and Cole 2006 and 2013 for Cicero's ideology of apotheosis.

54 Cic. *Cat.* 3.2, "Since we have elevated to divine status the man who founded this city because of his goodness and glory, the man who preserved this same city once it had been founded and expanded ought to be honored by you and by posterity." For this connection, see e.g. Vasaly 1993:42–60: Cicero in fact surpasses Romulus because it is more honorable to save a city that has already grown great than it is to found a city that may not thrive. In *DRP* 2.64–5, Cicero equates foundation and salvation. I have used Powell's text for the fragmentary *DRP*; I discuss the dialogue in more detail below, pp. 78–79, 225–233.

55 Similar is Cic. *Cons. Suo* fr. 8 Courtney. Havas 2000 connects Cicero's focus on Romulus with the preparation for the *ludi saeculares* (which were not in fact celebrated); on this issue see Cole 2013:18–62.

56 Also clear from e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 3.26, *Quirites, nullum ego a vobis praemium virtutis, nullum insigne honoris, nullum monumentum laudis postulo praeterquam huius diei memoriam*

hidden call for regal authority; in his later work *De Re Publica*, Cicero (through the mouth of his speaker, Scipio) notes that founders are gods, not kings.[57] This passage suggests a potentially inverse relationship between deification and kings: while divine (or perhaps quasi-divine) honors were acceptable, regal ones were not.[58] In the context of Republican honors, Cicero's request makes sense. The Republican Forum was dotted with statues of political actors who had aided or preserved their country.[59] In glorifying himself, Cicero asks to be added to their number.

The contrast between regal and divine helps dissociate Cicero from tyranny. In the 50s, this was a necessary task for Cicero, although it may not have been in the jubilant 60s; as his quarrels with Clodius make clear, Cicero *had* fought against this characterization as a tyrant and murderer because of his role against the Catilinarian conspirators. He had also been accused of glorifying his deeds, an example of which we have just seen.

The divinity that was a part of Romulus' life narrative is not emphasized in the invective against Cicero. In this case, 'Romulus' might mean simply a Roman, as we saw previously with Catullus. But it is more likely that the actual narrative events of Romulus' life are being used here, as well. Romulus, in the traditional narrative, was raised as a shepherd; local elites would not even intermarry with him or his people.[60] This is a humble station that he eventually overcame. Cicero was a *homo novus*, a parvenu to the established elite at Rome. Calling him a Romulus was not so much a slur on the founder as a jab at Cicero's own allegedly humble origins. This interpretation is strengthened by the use of *Arpinas*, which reiterates Cicero's recent arrival on the Roman

---

sempiternam ("Romans, I ask you for no other reward for my virtue, no mark of honor, no memento in praise except the eternal memory of this day").

57 See Cic. *DRP* 1.12, 1.64. The possible Greek background to the text, discussed by e.g. Alföldi 1971:27–8, Weinstock 1971:177, and Erskine 1991, does not change my argument here. Cicero's justification of apotheosis in the *DRP* is analyzed by Cole 2006, arguing largely for the invention of tradition.

58 This can perhaps be seen in the Roman triumph as well, and helps explain the divine honors granted during the Republic (for which see Alföldi 1971:112–30; Weinstock 1971:185–7; Beard 2007:233–8). Cole 2013 argues that Cicero was instrumental in promulgating the idea of deification for civic virtue at Rome; given Cicero's dominance of surviving literature and the appearance of similar themes in Varro (Cole 2013:194), his argument seems fragile. I discuss Caesar's divinity in more detail below, chapter four, but its full ramifications cannot be pursued here.

59 See the excellent discussion of Muth 2012, with ample bibliography.

60 See Livy 1.9.2–6; DH 2.30.2 and 2.31.1. Dench 1995 connects the story with the importance of local identity after the Social War.

political scene. If Cicero was a founding figure anywhere, it was in his hometown, not Rome.

My analysis of the Sallustian evidence has reinforced my argument that 'Romulus' was a polyvalent term. Further, there is no significance in Cicero's failure to refer to Romulus directly, but rather by circumlocution, in the *First Catilinarian*. His audience would presumably have been able to make the connection from 'founder' to 'Romulus', and there does not seem to be a reason to believe that 'Romulus' was inherently more negative than '*conditor* (that is, Romulus)'. Cicero does use the name elsewhere without disapproval;[61] it seems more likely that Cicero's non-usage of Romulus in this case is simply *variatio*.

Plutarch

The final use of Romulus in the late Republic is reported by Plutarch, who relates that the senator Piso Caesonius threatened Pompey by saying that he would die like Romulus if he continued to act like Romulus.[62] This threat is made during the discussion of the *lex Gabinia*, which set Pompey at the head of an immense army with the task of eliminating pirates from the eastern Mediterranean. Such power was potentially dangerous, despite its limited duration. The senate opposed the command, which gave Pompey control over twenty legions.[63] As Plutarch would have known, this mission was completed in a matter of months, rather than the three years allotted, and Pompey was rewarded with command over the war against Mithridates the following year. These were immense triumphs for Pompey, and in some ways similar to the career of Sulla: both had large armies and had fought in the East. It is important to emphasize, though, that while the senate in the early 60s may have had Sulla's march on Rome and dictatorship in mind, the increasing power of Pompey is almost certainly clearer in hindsight (both to Plutarch and to modern historians) than it was to contemporaries. Pompey had a good number of competitors in his early career.

The threat of Piso is better understood as a later addition to the tradition. Ver Eecke argued that the Pompey example represents the first documented instance of "anti-romulisme", that is, the negatively propagandistic use of

61 E.g., Cic. *Cat.* 1.33; *Div.* 1.107.

62 Plut. *Pomp.* 25.4

63 See Cic. *Leg. Manil.* 32–5; *MRR* 2.146. Cicero's support of Pompey's increasingly extensive military commands is possibly the best evidence that contemporaries did not all see Pompey as a threat at this period.

Romulus. She further suggested that Piso, in making this threat, uses 'Romulus' not in response to Pompey's own use of the founder, but rather in recognition of Sulla's use of the founder.[64] This is problematic: because the only source for the story is Plutarch, we cannot be sure that this negative use of Romulus was in fact current in Pompey's own day. In fact, as I have argued above, our other evidence from this period rarely mentions Romulus; when it does, it is not in this negative sense. In Plutarch's day, the situation was different. As I will discuss below, the tradition about Romulus becomes much more negative in the 40s, and by the imperial period, there were standard ways to depict Romulus. Our evidence from the earliest fragments to the 60s, however, indicates that the choices were less limited. For this reason, it is worth mentioning that Dio's independent account of the same episode omits this anecdote.[65]

As ver Eecke pointed out, Pompey modeled himself on Alexander, not Romulus; thus the founder was not a particularly apposite example here.[66] Moreover, the threat is too vague to be of use: Romulus could be portrayed as a good king, whose death was mourned by the people.[67] We have seen some evidence for this in Ennius, whose account of Romulus' death cites him as *pater*, *sanguen dis*, and *dius*. If Piso had meant to criticize Pompey, this is not the image he would want to rise in everyone's mind.

This laudatory depiction is clearly not what is meant in context, but should make us pause. Again, one must emphasize that the *Annales* was a school text and familiar to all educated Romans. It would be among the first places, if not the first, to seek *exempla*, and would color the interpretations of those who had learned from it. We do not know that Romulus was not a tyrant in Ennius, but we do know that he was praised in fulsome terms as (semi-)divine. In the examples of Sallust, Catullus, and Cicero seen above, all of whom are far closer in time to Pompey's era than Plutarch is, 'Romulus' had to be qualified in some way in order to be used disparagingly. That is not the case here. Plutarch, living almost two hundred years later when the Romulus-tyrant link was established, may not have considered this.[68] Taken together, the various problems with the

---

64 ver Eecke 2008:433–5, with further bibliography; the term "anti-romulisme" is on p. 433.

65 Dio 36.24.3.

66 ver Eecke 2008:434.

67 See Cic. *DRP* 2.4–20; Enn. *Ann.* 105–9 and 111 Sk. Skutsch notes on line 109 that "Romulus has led his people from obscure beginning into the light ... In doing this he has become their father" (p. 259); this is reinforced by Ennius' language, which is similar to that used for actual birth. Association of Pompey with Romulus in this sense is extremely complimentary.

68 On Plutarch's methods of research and characterization, see e.g. Pelling 1979.

Pisonian threat seem to imply that Plutarch's evidence is (perhaps unintentionally) anachronistic, rather than accurately reporting a story about Pompey.

This may be due at least in part to Plutarch's ignorance. This story seems to refer to the version in which Romulus was a tyrant and died by being dismembered by the senate.[69] The fact that this option appears in Livy indicates that it may have been extant in Pompey's day as well; however, it is equally likely that this variant came into being later, with the assassination of Caesar. Plutarch may have found the tyrant narrative only in post-Caesarian writers. We know that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, was a source for Plutarch's *Life* of Romulus, and Dionysius offers the dismemberment story as one option for Romulus' death. Plutarch then may have thought that this tyrannical Romulus offered a dramatic threat to Pompey at a key moment. Later Romans, such as Lucan, certainly drew a parallel between Pompey and Caesar on the one hand, and the twins on the other.[70] It is less clear that a comparison between Pompey and Romulus would have been viable in 67.

The limited surviving evidence about Remus from the mid-first century makes it risky to draw any firm conclusions about his cultural valence at this time. The same could be said about Romulus, although there is more evidence for his appearance in political speech. But there is little evidence for his depiction as a wholly negative figure, even during the period of the civil wars. Instead, the founder was an ambiguous character, capable of being used as either a good or a bad example. The significance of his name was determined by the context, rather than by the story of Romulus himself. This point has already been made by ver Eecke; unlike her, though, I do not see a change in the Sullan period. Instead, I suggest that there is a greater degree of continuity than difference from the second century to the first. As I argued in the previous chapter, Romulus and Remus were didactic examples of aristocratic competition in the second century. It is thus likely that they continued to play this role in the first century, at least in some texts. The limited surviving evidence suggests that the unsympathetic view of Romulus had to be activated by using an adjective; this need for activation implies that Romulus was a polyvalent figure at this time.

In our surviving sources, Romulus' status as king and founder is emphasized, rather than his relationship with others. His complicity in the death of Remus is absent, removing any censure that might be attached to him; likewise,

---

69 See Livy 1.16.4; DH 2.56.4. Neither attributes this story to a source.

70 See e.g. Fantham 2010:214–18. Edlund 1984 offers world-myth parallels; Wiseman 1995a:141–4 discusses other contemporary reuses of the myth; Geiger 2004 discusses late antique evidence.

he is not blamed for rejoicing inwardly at the death of Titus Tatius.[71] Even where these events seem pertinent to the topic at hand (for example, Cicero's treatment of the Catilinarian conspirators or Sulla's proscriptions), they are not explicitly mentioned. This absence may indicate that Romulus continued to be a favorable model for the most part, or at least not a tyrant. Although it is dangerous to argue from silence, the surviving material makes it clear that there were *opportunities* to draw a parallel between Romulus, murder, and tyranny. These opportunities were not taken up. We can say with assurance, then, that the possibility was there, but not necessarily acted upon.

What this indicates for the death of Remus is unclear. Surviving authors show only a passing interest in the founder; they show almost none in his twin. But that need not mean that Remus was forgotten. To a Roman audience, the explicit naming of Remus was not necessary. The twins' story was so well known that mention of one would immediately recall the other; this interchangeability, I have argued, can be seen in Catullus' use of either twin at will. I have also argued that the twins' similar status reflects continuity from the second century, and may thus indicate a more positive understanding of Romulus in this period than most previous scholarship has admitted.

Our relatively few sources for this period offer a primarily negative view of Romulus, stemming from the use of negative qualifiers. But their limited scope makes it difficult to gain a full view of the founder in the first half of the first century. The works of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus have often been considered a source for lost fragments of mid-first century annalists. Although attribution is difficult, the survival of multiple variant stories about Romulus in these authors supports the idea of a mixed and flexible first-century tradition.

Dionysius, Livy, and Late Republican Fragments

Modern wisdom holds that both Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy used earlier sources and can be expected to reflect to at least a certain degree what these writers said.[72] Because the aim of this chapter is to examine Romulus in

71 As he will later be in Livy; see below, pp. 178–179. This story, like that of Remus' death, does not appear in the sources of this period even when potentially relevant. See ver Eecke 2008:432 for the argument that the fratricide was less important to the late Republican tradition than the issue of Romulus' apotheosis.

72 Livy, writing in the late 30s or early 20s, names the following sources for the first decade: Valerius Antias, Aelius Tubero, Claudius Quadrigarius, and Licinius Macer. Dionysius, writing c. 9 BCE, includes Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, and Tubero in the long list of

his late Republican context, however, it is worth attempting to discover how much of our existing knowledge can be securely attributed to that period. I suggest that the state of the evidence does not allow a reconstruction of a mid-first century worldview; rather, Livy's evidence is representative of his own triumviral viewpoint, while Dionysius' is representative of the Augustan era. Although this investigation ultimately yields a negative result, the previous use of these texts to reconstruct the historical arguments of late annalistic historians makes it a necessity; I leave this section purposefully brief.

The search for Republican accounts is hampered by three complementary factors: first, that Livy and Dionysius only occasionally name their sources; second, that they seem to condense these sources considerably (particularly Livy); and, most importantly, that they were not simply copying, but actively choosing and reshaping their received tradition. Thus the stories that we find in Dionysius and Livy are evidence for not only their sources' day, but also their own. This is a relatively uncontroversial point, but worth emphasis: it is difficult to disentangle the original from its presentation in a composite account featuring multiple perspectives.

Because Livy and Dionysius rarely name their sources in their accounts of Romulus and Remus, we often cannot trace particular variants back to a particular author. Livy in particular refers to 'some' or 'other' historians with a high probability of narrative reshaping; even when he explicitly attributes a variant, he is not necessarily quoting. Again, this is not new, but must be emphasized. Dionysius, on the other hand, wrote in a different language than many of his more recent sources. This has led Gabba to argue that Dionysius disdained Latin sources and used only Greek material.[73] If this were the case, that would limit his usefulness for the events of the first century, when historical accounts were often written in Latin. But because Dionysius interacted with Romans and seems to have had at least a working knowledge of Latin, Gabba's interpretation seems too extreme.[74] Indeed, it contradicts Dionysius' own statements.[75]

---

sources he consulted (see further DH 1.79–80). Diodorus Siculus, who definitely discussed the foundation in his universal history, is unfortunately very fragmentary at this juncture. There is not space here for a detailed consideration of all the sources for these authors (a question that has been exhaustively studied in any case); see e.g. Ogilvie 1965:5–17 and Oakley 1997:13–150, both with bibliography; Delcourt 2005:54–7 and Gabba 1991:205–13 and 2000:25–50. The sources of surviving fragments of Roman historians are neatly summarized in *FRHist* 1.3–137.

73 Gabba 1991:85–8.

74 Clear from, e.g., the *Letter to Pompey*. For Dionysius' intellectual milieu, see Delcourt 2005:28–35; Peirano 2010.

75 E.g., DH 1.79.

As his named sources cover a vast span of time, though, it is difficult to ascertain the date and currency in Rome of many of his variants, particularly those stories he prefers.

The narrative of the twins' birth in Livy and Dionysius is similar, and similar also to the version found in Cicero's *de Re Publica* and Ovid's *Fasti*. This 'vulgate' tradition has already been summarized, and its seamlessness implies that variants in the first century were minimal. This is not the case with the death of Remus. Each historian offers two different accounts of Remus' death and Romulus' role in it, although these accounts are not identical to each other.[76] Livy presents one version that might be termed 'exculpatory', in which Remus dies in a mêlée by an anonymous hand, rather than because of Romulus, and one in which the founder himself is to blame. Ver Eecke argues that the exculpatory version, which also appears in Dionysius (and in the *OGR*, from which she draws her primary conclusion), was introduced into the tradition in the Sullan period by Licinius Macer as a response to the Sullan and Marian attacks on Rome.[77] She also prefers a Sullan date for the other exculpatory version, in which Celer, rather than Romulus, is the agent of Remus' death.[78] This account also appears in the fragments of Diodorus Siculus, which makes it at least contemporary with Cicero, if not earlier.[79]

Attributing these variants to a specific date or event is problematic, as the evidence for the fragmentary historians is weak. The history of Licinius Macer, once viewed as partisan and 'popular', has been re-evaluated.[80] His views are not clear enough from surviving source material to draw conclusions about his individual contribution to the historical tradition, rather than identifying change over time. Chaos and violence were not introduced to Roman politics by Sulla, and it is conceivable that these variants could date back to the Gracchi,

---

76 Livy 1.6.4–7.2; DH 1.87.2–4.

77 ver Eecke 2008:218. See Macer (*FRHist* 27 F3 = 3 Chassignet = 3 B-W = 3 Walt); *OGR* 19.7, *ibidem obsidentes Remum et Faustulum interfectos* ("Remus and Faustulus were killed in that same place while they were attacking"), which perhaps alludes to a far more lengthy and bitter quarrel between the partisans of the twins. For the question of the *OGR*'s reliability as a source, see above, pp. 21–22.

78 ver Eecke 2008:216; here she compares the trauma of the proscriptions, and suggests that Antias promoted this version, although the material contained within it is old. Delcourt 2005:245–8 on the contrary argues for a strongly Augustan reading.

79 DS 8.5.

80 See, e.g., Gabba 2000:25–50 (originally published in 1967), Walt 1997, and the assessment in *FRHist* I.320–31 [Oakley], stressing his rationalizing tendencies. Macer was *tr.pl.* 73. Oakley argues that Dionysius' and Livy's account are more different than is usually thought (*FRHist* III.421).

if not earlier.[81] The ultimate source of these stories is impossible to locate with certainty. More fruitful, perhaps, is the question of why two versions appear in both Augustan-era historians, and what to make of the fact that while one of the options is the same in both Dionysius and Livy, the other is quite different.

This difference is significant, because Livy's critical account of Romulus is the most closely connected with violence in the city's political life. The story is quite brief, like most of Livy's account of the foundation.[82] What he does say, though, has an interesting precedent. The murder of Tiberius Gracchus in 133 allegedly led Scipio Aemilianus to quote a line from Homer: ὣς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.[83] Our first evidence for this story appears in the fragmentary books of Diodorus Siculus, who composed his history in the mid-first century. Romulus' response to Remus crossing his wall in Livy, while not a direct translation of Homer, is very close: *sic deinde quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea*.[84] This near-quotation seems more likely to come from an account of the Gracchi than directly from Homer. If so, Livy's use of this maxim identifies Remus with Tiberius Gracchus, or more accurately, the death of Remus with the urban violence that began under Gracchus and continued until the foundation of the Principate.[85] The quotation supports Wiseman's argument that Remus was associated with the plebeians.

The fact that this is the more common story (*vulgatior fama*) suggests that it was by the latter half of the first century that violence became the primary theme of the foundation narrative. Livy's words suggest that this story was already known to his readers. Since many of Livy's named sources were writing only shortly before he was, it is possible that the major change in this narrative should be located in the mid- or late-first century, rather than the Sullan period. Livy's sources are likely to have shared the same influences as Horace and Cicero, and Livy himself began working on his history in the 30s, offering a

81 The most complete account of violence in Roman politics is still Lintott 1968; Santangelo 2007 suggests a less bloodthirsty view of Sulla (while not as forgiving as Keaveney 1984). For an example of the violence of Sullan politics, see e.g. the mob scene during the Mithridatic wars (App. *BC* 1.290–2), with discussion in Sumi 2009.

82 The brevity of Livy's account is perhaps best exemplified by Ogilvie's (1965) failure to comment on the episode.

83 Hom. *Od.* 1.47 (about Aegisthus), "thus may anyone else who dares such deeds perish"; cf. Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 21.4 and DS 34/5.7.3. For Scipio's actions in this period, see e.g. Astin 1967:190–240.

84 Livy 1.7.1.

85 Wiseman (1995a). In antiquity, Livy was associated with traditional Republican morality; see Tacitus' description of him as a 'Pompeian' (*Ann.* 4.34); now problematized by Ridley 2010.

terminus ante quem.[86] The negative value of Romulus is much clearer in these two authors, whose relevant works survive complete (or mostly so). Livy's choice not to explicitly cite his sources, however, make it impossible to separate his own post-Caesarian perspective from his presentation of the material he has found in earlier writers. Because of this, I will return to Livy and Dionysius in the context of their own time; next, I will examine the Ciceronian evidence, in which a significant change can be securely ascertained.

Cicero

Cicero's work reveals a changing conception of Romulus in the mid-first century. This change is visible in Cicero because so much of his work survives, which in turn allows us to see a difference in the depiction of Romulus from the *de Re Publica* of the late 50s to the *de Officiis* of 44. Because both of these works are examples of the same genre, the differences in the depiction of Romulus are more likely to be tied to changes in Cicero's opinion than to the differing purposes of the text.[87] In this case, it seems likely that that the change in Cicero's depiction of Romulus is tied to the conflict between Caesar and Pompey and the defeat of the Pompeians in the civil war. It is at this point, in the 50s and 40s, that we again see Romulus appear with Remus in political speech. The return of Remus at this period is not accidental: it is in the late 50s and 40s that the collegiality of the Republic failed. Remus' death offered a way to work through that failure.

The marked change in Cicero's depictions of Romulus over the course of this period finds a parallel in his despair about the situation in Rome. In order to express these feelings, he turns to the use of myth, rather than discussing contemporary politics directly. This is similar to his use of philosophical argument and rhetorical set-pieces for the same purpose. His turn to philosophy in this

86 The traditional date for Livy's first book is in the early 20s (see e.g. the defense of Ridley 2010, with full bibliography); Paul Burton (2000) has suggested a slightly earlier dating of the late 30s, which has found some acceptance (e.g., Farrell and Nelis 2013:1). Even the late date assumes that Livy began writing around the time of Actium.

87 As the anonymous reviewer pointed out to me, *de Re Publica* is a dialogue, whereas *de Officiis* is a paternal treatise, and this may affect Cicero's presentation of Romulus. As the historical survey in *DRP* 2 is (as far as it survives) essentially monologic in form, I do not think the dialogic form is a differentiator. The speaker (Scipio Aemilianus recollecting Cato the Elder) may well be, as I discuss below.

period was not a withdrawal from political affairs, as is sometimes suggested;[88] rather, it was a change in direction. Cicero's use of Romulus in this treatise, as well as his other philosophical works, is a means of commenting on politics at Rome.[89]

In the second book of his *de Re Publica*, Cicero (through the character of Scipio Aemilianus, himself citing Cato) outlines the history of Rome from Romulus to an unknown point, but certainly through the foundation of the Republic.[90] Although the dialogue is fragmentary, his account of Romulus is almost complete.[91] Here, Romulus is an ideal king, and Remus is barely mentioned;[92] fratricide is completely omitted from the narrative. This is similar to what we have already seen of the use of the twins in the early and mid-first century: Remus is sidelined, and Romulus' name is subordinated to the needs of the individual author. Cicero is attempting to show that Rome started from the best beginnings, despite its current state, and hence his Romulus is a good and wise king. This characterization is true whether we attribute the information to Cicero, to Scipio, or to Cato. In a letter to Quintus, Cicero relates that his friend Sallustius suggested that he change the setting of the dialogue to a contemporary one.[93] Sallustius' words, as reported by Cicero, indicate that the sentiments expressed in the dialogue would not be out of place coming from Cicero himself; it thus seems likely that Scipio's account of Roman history (and of Romulus) remained viable in the 50s.

Timothy Cornell has rightly argued that the inclusion or exclusion of material in *de Re Publica* 2 was based on Cicero's philosophical aims, rather than his knowledge of history.[94] If the positive image of Romulus were unusual, Cicero could not have deployed it fruitfully in this dialogue; his readers would have

88 A fairly typical way of describing his output at this time; see e.g. Meier 1997:460. *Contra*, see e.g. Lintott 2008:339; in his section on Cicero's works of the mid-40s, however, Lintott discusses only the philosophical arguments (pp. 323–34).

89 See e.g. Gildenhard 2006:206–7; Gildenhard 2007; Baraz 2012; Atkins 2013:19.

90 The dialogue will be discussed more fully in the final chapter.

91 Cic. *DRP* 2.4–18. References are to Powell's OCT.

92 He appears briefly in reference to the twins' exposure at Cic. *DRP* 2.4.

93 Cic. *QF* 3.5.1–2: *admonitus sum ab illo multo maiore auctoritate illis de rebus dici posse, si ipse loquerer de re publica, praesertim cum essem non Heraclides Ponticus, sed consularis et is, qui in maximis versatus in re publica rebus essem; quae tam antiquis hominibus attribuerem, ea visum iri ficta esse* ('he [Sallustius] suggested that if I myself were to speak about the state, it would be possible to do so with far greater authority—especially since I am no Heraclides of Pontus, but a former consul, and one exceptionally well-versed in public affairs at that! Indeed (he said) when I attributed these things to men of such a bygone age, the account seemed fictional ...')

94 Cornell 2001. See also Fox 1996:5–48.

noticed that something was missing. Instead, we must see this favorable view of Romulus as a recognized possibility in the 50s.

This state of affairs accords with what I have already argued in relation to the Catullan evidence: it is only by using a negative qualifier that Romulus becomes a poor model. On his own, 'Romulus' represents simply the city's founder, without the stigma of Remus' death, and a model for other Romans. Cicero emphasizes this exemplary value when he relates the reasons for apotheosis. According to his account, the deification of Romulus is particularly meaningful because it is recent; previous acts of deification, such as Lycurgus or Hercules, were performed by irrational and credulous men, unlike the reasonable and educated early Romans. This is partly Roman chauvenism; but again, it implies that the favorable Romulus was a recognized character.

At some point over the course of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, this depiction of Romulus changed. Most notably, we see at this time the reintroduction of Remus into the narrative; he is here mentioned explicitly, a situation which we will see continues well into the Principate. It is possible, although it must remain only speculation, that at least part of the reason behind the reappearance of Remus at this juncture was the familial relationship between Pompey and Caesar.[95] That two relatives were fighting over power, even if they were not brothers, was perhaps enough to make the twins more relevant at this time. With this historical framework, dyadic rivalry may have seemed a more attractive way to examine Rome's earlier history.

In the *de Officiis*, written towards the end of Cicero's own life, we find the first known unequivocal condemnation of Romulus as the murderer of his brother.[96] This is important for two reasons: first, because Remus was largely absent from the political discourse of the late Republic, as far as we can tell (see above); and second, because earlier uses of the founder tended to stress his role as a positive model and a good king.[97] The change in the depiction of Romulus is particularly noteworthy here because it occurs in the work of a single author and between two works that are prescriptive rather than narrative. The explicitly negative Romulus on display here thus represents a break with the preceding tradition.

---

95 Caesar was Pompey's father-in-law through the latter's marriage to the former's daughter Julia; see above, n. 35.

96 *Off.* is usually dated to 44 BCE on the strength of Cicero's letters (Griffin and Atkins 1991:xviii–xix).

97 This is true not only of written accounts, but also of the iconographic appearance of the wolf and twins throughout the Republic as the symbol of Rome (see below, pp. 120–121); this visual theme stressed the miraculous nature of the twins' salvation as well as the strength and fertility that the city's inhabitants wished for themselves.

> At in eo rege, qui urbem condidit, non item. Species enim utilitatis animum pepulit eius; cui cum visum esset utilius solum quam cum altero regnare, fratrem interemit. Omisit hic et pietatem et humanitatem, ut id, quod utile videbatur, neque erat, assequi posset, et tamen muri causa opposuit, speciem honestatis nec probabilem nec sane idoneam. Peccavit igitur, pace vel Quirini vel Romuli dixerim.[98]

Our evidence is not complete enough to say whether Cicero was the first to articulate this change. Absolute primacy is not necessarily of value in this case; my argument is unaffected if Cicero should turn out to be the second or fifth to blame Romulus for his brother's demise. Rather, this passage is evidence for a change in the discourse, which Cicero expects his audience to be able to understand and appreciate.

Two aspects of the passage are crucial: first, that the Ciceronian evidence shows an apparent change of opinion. Romulus the ideal king, over the course of about a decade, becomes Romulus the fratricide. This may be simply a rhetorical change, but Cicero knew that both works were being read by the same group of friends. Although consistency was not required, a change would still have been noticed. This is especially marked because Cicero had stressed his own similarity to the *conditor* two decades earlier, in a speech that had been circulated. Because Cicero identified himself with Romulus at the same time as he was murdering citizens, it is difficult to believe that he would have endorsed the morally repugnant Romulus that he depicts in *de Officiis.* Instead, Cicero's reinterpretation suggests that the name 'Romulus' itself has taken on a negative meaning.

In addition to his reassessment of Romulus, Cicero here draws a parallel between the founder and the events of the 40s, and in particular the beginnings of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey. This war could easily be ascribed to the desire of both Caesar and Pompey to rule alone, rather than together; such a motive was stressed by later authors.[99] The fact that both Caesar and (allegedly) Pompey were associated with Romulus in their day would only

---

98 Cic. *Off.* 3.41, "But it is different in the case of that king who founded the city. For the appearance of utility drove his soul. When it seemed more useful to him to rule alone than with another, he killed his brother. He abandoned both piety and humanity in grasping at what seemed useful (but was not). Still, he alleged that the wall was his grievance, a façade of integrity that was neither probable nor at all sufficient. He thus did wrong, whether I call him Quirinus or Romulus."

99 E.g., Lucan *Phars.* 1.125; [Sall.] *Or. ad Caes.* 2.2. Wiseman 1995a:12 states that this passage is easier to understand if a period of joint rule is assumed, but does not explain why.

underline the tie to recent politics; the introduction of Caesar's statue to the shrine of Quirinus on the Quirinal in 45 underscores the connection.[100] This temple was supposedly dedicated by Caesar's ancestor, Proculus Julius, after he saw a vision of the deified Romulus.[101] Similarly, the false assertion of wrongs done may have resonated with Cicero, not only because of Caesar and Pompey, but also in relation to many other enmities of the late Republic. The connection between the survivor Romulus and the survivor Caesar is thus fairly strong.

Cicero, although unable or perhaps unwilling to speak freely, can indicate his despair for Rome by blaming Romulus, the founder and model for the state. The condemnation of Romulus, resulting from Cicero's apparent change of heart, might be connected with the death of Pompey. Cicero admired Pompey in many ways, and, as I mentioned above, Pompey and Caesar were related by marriage. It may also relate to Cicero's intermittent quarrels with his own brother. It is more likely, though, that the conflict between metaphorical brothers—the Roman citizen body, whom Cicero wanted to be in a state of *concordia*—precipitated this change.[102] In the *de Re Publica*, Cicero wanted to show a sympathetic Romulus, a model *rector* for the future. In *de Officiis*, in contrast, there is no future for Republican Rome. Cicero was quite gloomy about the city's prospects even after the assassination of Caesar: in April of 44 he wrote to Atticus that the Republic was lost, repeating his judgments from before the assassination.[103] A similar despair is a likely cause of Cicero's depiction of the founder here, in autumn 44. Romulus, and, by implication, the death of Remus, is mentioned only briefly and plays no particular role in the dialogue. His actions are simply judged, and Cicero finds them morally wrong.

These two depictions of Romulus are irreconcilable, and cannot be explained solely on the grounds of Cicero's exemplary history in the *de Re Publica*. He mentions the birth of twins, triggering the knowledge that all Roman readers would have of the remainder of this story. By omitting further reference to Remus, Cicero implies that Romulus had *not* done wrong. What does seem clear is that in 44 the depiction of Romulus as a murderer resonated more deeply with Cicero than it had in the late 50s. It seems likely that this change

---

100 For the statue, see Dio 43.45.3 and Cic. *Att.* 12.45.2; this temple is discussed further in chapter four. For Pompey and Caesar as 'Romulus', see above, pp. 60–73.

101 See e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 1.3 and *DRP* 2.20.

102 On metaphorical brothership in Rome, see e.g. Bannon 1997 and Armstrong 2013, both with further bibliography.

103 Cic. *Att.* 14.1.1. See also, e.g., *Att.* 14.9.2 (April 44); 14.21.2 (May 44). Santangelo 2013:115–48 offers an account of the increasing fatalism in the 40s.

was due to the civil strife of 49–46, at least in part. The changing intellectual landscape of the first century BCE also offered fertile soil for reconceptualizing the founder. An increasing interest in Greek philosophy allowed elites to depict traditional *exempla* in a more negative fashion; if Romulus no longer offered a model to follow or avoid, philosophical writings could.[104] In the *de Re Publica*, Cicero unites these two models; in the *de Officiis*, he separates them. In order to avoid following Romulus' example, there needed to be a positive model to follow instead. Philosophy, at least for Cicero, offered an alternative (not a replacement)[105] to exemplary founders.

But the negative image of Romulus was not confined to Cicero; its continuing importance, as seen in Horace, indicates that this depiction was closely tied to civil war. Both authors express dismay that an individual's desire to be the best has overshadowed the spirit of cooperation that ought to exist in the Republic.

Horace

Horace's seventh *Epode* has been the focus of much attention for its closing lines, which explain the Roman civil wars as a curse resulting from the death of Remus. Composed probably in the heat of the struggle among members of the second triumvirate,[106] the *Epodes* oscillate between the topically political (particularly 7 and 16) and the seemingly unrelated. This is perhaps intentional. Horace tells us that he fought with Brutus at Philippi, a mistake in allegiance that cost him his family property.[107] It was only later that he was re-introduced into the highest circles at Rome; this was possibly the result of the *Epodes*, and seemingly not before their completion.[108] The persona featured in these poems was a dispossessed man and seems disillusioned. This is perhaps not to be identified with Horace the writer; the poet does not seem to have been as impoverished as he claimed, and it is not clear whether he had been adopted

104 See e.g. Wallace-Hadrill 2005:65–8, with some bibliography.

105 See the detailed breakdown of exemplary figures in Bücher 2006 (Anhang III) for the continued and varied use of *exempla* in Cicero's speeches.

106 The *Epodes* are conventionally dated to c. 42–31 (Watson 2003:1), and *Ep.* 7 in particular to 39–8 BCE in the *communis opinio* (Hierche 1974; Villeneuve/Hellegoucarc'h 1991; Watson 2003:271). Kraggerud 1984:65 suggests that the poem should be downdated to 32 BCE; he is followed by Mankin 1995:143. Either way, the context is triumviral.

107 *Epist.* 2.2.46–51.

108 *Ep.* 9 seems to have been at least edited, if not composed, later, as it is set at Actium. See on the dating issue Mankin 1995:1–3 and 10–12, with some bibliography.

into the triumviral coterie. But regardless of the personal and professional success of the poet, Horace was not precluded from writing from a different perspective. The dismay that he expresses at the situation in Rome suggests that Horace remained troubled by the events at Philippi and after, regardless of the poem's date of composition. His depiction of Remus as an innocent victim of savage rivalry fits this social context well.

The seventh *Epode* begins by recalling the extent of the Roman world and moves on to the destruction of the lives of people closer to home.[109] The contrast between the Roman armies who are able to subdue far-off nations and who yet choose to kill their own is pointed:

> Quo, quo scelesti ruitis? aut cur dexteris
> aptantur enses conditi?
> parumne campis atque Neptuno super
> fusum est Latini sanguinis,
> non ut superbas invidae Karthaginis
> Romanus arces ureret,
> intactus aut Britannus ut descenderet
> sacra catenatus via,
> sed ut secundum vota Parthorum sua
> Vrbs haec periret dextera?
> neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus
> umquam nisi in dispar feris.
> furorne caecus[110] an rapit vis acrior
> an culpa? responsum date.
> tacent et albus ora pallor inficit
> mentesque perculsae stupent.
> sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt
> scelusque fraternae necis,
> ut immerentis fluxit in terram Remi
> sacer nepotibus cruor.[111]

109 Carthage, Britain, and Parthia, lines 5–9; compare *Ecl.* 1.61–6.

110 This has been emended to *caecos*, a change that does not seem necessary. I here follow the text of Mankin 1995; see e.g. Watson 2003:279–80 for support of the accusative.

111 Hor. *Ep.* 7, "Where are you rushing to, villains? Why are hidden swords clenched in your hands? Hasn't enough Latin blood spewed over lands and sea—not so that a Roman could burn the proud citadel of hated Carthage, nor the uninjured Briton parade down the Sacred Way in chains, but so that this city could ruin itself in fulfullment of the Parthians' prayers? This was not the custom of wolves or lions or any animal; they do not fight with

Horace here memorializes bloodshed,[112] addressing an unknown audience, possibly the people at large.[113] Lindsay Watson has emphasized "the very public character of the *Epode*, which is shaped as an address to the *scelesti cives* in their totality, and not as a critique of the rival dynasts."[114] He further noted the similarities between Horace's speech in this *Epode* and the techniques of public address discussed by Greek rhetoricians. This scenario is slightly artificial; although Horace's words imply that such an open forum is meant here, the very nature of a poetic book speaks against it. Horace is not actually addressing the general populace of Rome,[115] which had little say in the warring between Octavian and Antony, but rather its elite members, whose greater ability to put an end to struggles for power corresponded to their increased wealth. These more powerful members of society would also be more likely to feel the sting of images such as the chained Briton being paraded in a triumph,[116] a traditionally elite sphere of activity that has come to a halt due to civil strife.

The first half of the poem, then, is taken up in this generalizing address. The second half becomes more specific, speaking not of missed opportunities, but of genuine opposition to strife. The first example that Horace provides is that of wolves and lions, who, although wild animals, do not attack their own species.[117] The reference to *lupis* here is almost certainly meant to remind the reader of the *lupa* who saved the founder of the city, a reminiscence that is reinforced by the appearance of the founders at the end of the poem.[118] By using an animal from the Roman foundation legend, Horace underlines the age-old distinction between the behavior of (supposedly savage) animals and (supposedly civilized) men. In the foundation legend, the gentle she-wolf res-

---

equals. Answer me: does blind rage seize you, or a harsher power, or guilt? They are silent. Ashy pallor stains their faces; their minds are stricken and dazed. So it is: harsh fates and the crime of a brother's murder drive the Romans, as the blood of innocent Remus, cursed to his descendants, flowed to the earth."

112 E.g., Hor. *Ep*. 7.4.

113 In what follows, I use 'Horace' to mean 'the speaker of *Ep*. 7' as a convenience; I do not mean to imply that the poetic persona and the poet are necessarily to be identified.

114 Watson 2003:267. Similarly, Hierche 1974:108 thinks that "le développement de cette épode se déroule entre deux mots," *scelesti* and *scelus*, bracketing the beginning and ends of the poem.

115 Cf. Watson 2003:268, "*Epode* 7, then, is no internalized monologue but a dramatized fiction in which the reader must envisage Horace preaching to the populace of Rome." See also Hierche 1974:108–12 for the colloquial language of this *Epode*.

116 Hor. *Ep*. 7.7–8.

117 Hor. *Ep*. 7.11–12.

118 See Mankin 1995:147, who notes that this "may be a reference" to the Roman she-wolf.

cues the infant founders after their cruel uncle has ordered their exposure. The animal, in nursing the twins, shows more humanity than the king. This contrast is sharpened when Romulus and Remus are mentioned in the closing lines of the *Epode*; although they had suckled the *lupa*, they had not absorbed her most important traits, such as the disinclination to fight against kin.[119] Instead, they gained only her ferocity.

The last two couplets ascribe the current civil wars to the pollution caused at the city's foundation, reaching back to mythology and the city's origins to find a cause for the Romans' current guilt.[120] This is the way that the episode of Remus' death is normally viewed by modern scholarship; as I have argued in this chapter, though, it was unusual before this period. In Horace, as in Cicero, we find an unequivocal condemnation of Romulus as the murderer of his brother. Horace states it as fact, without explanation or any indication that there are other options. This suits the argumentative context of the *Epode*, but does not offer much help in tracing the evolution of Romulus. That Horace's criticism occurs only a few years after Cicero's suggests that blaming Romulus is a contemporary theme. This is a change from the polyvalence of Romulus that appears even in the intense political atmosphere of the 60s and 50s. As with Cicero a few years earlier, Horace's choice to stress the foundation as a source of evil for Rome seems likely to be due to internecine strife: in this case, the proscriptions, the failure of the Republicans at Philippi, and the massacre after Perusia. No single event need be the precipitating factor. Rather, all of them, occurring only a few years before the composition of the seventh *Epode*, form the background to Horace's interpretation of Rome's history.

His criticism of Romulus, while perhaps not completely surprising after the options given in lines 13–14, nonetheless implies that the poem itself is in some ways a vain exercise. If the Romans are propelled to civil war by ancestral guilt, there is no point in exhorting them to stop; it is fated, as Horace himself states.[121] Instead, Horace here changes gears, and offers an excuse for the current violence. This is accomplished by transferring the blame from a group of individuals, addressed in lines 1–14 and referred to in lines 15 and 16, to a single (proto-)Roman, Romulus. Watson sees a precedent for Horace's representation of Remus' death in Cicero's *de Officiis*, while Cicero himself was influenced

119 This can be related back to the negative tradition about the Romans as wolfish; see e.g. ver Eecke 2008:1–100, with bibliography; Wiseman 1995a:14–15. An ancient example is e.g. Justin 28.2.8–10; *RRC* 553/427, a (Samnite) bull goring the Roman wolf during the Social War.

120 On the addressees' guilt, see Watson 2003:281–2.

121 Hor. *Ep.* 7.17, *fata acerba Romanos agunt* ("harsh fates spur the Romans on").

by the acts of Caesar.[122] But there are no verbal echoes of the *de Officiis* passage here, and it seems more likely that Horace was not influenced by Cicero or Caesar at all.[123] Instead, both Cicero and Horace shared a similar range of experiences that encouraged them to view the competitive nature of the foundation in a newly unfavorable way.

In the change from the second-person addressees to the omniscient narrator who blames Romulus, Horace also guides the reader's view of the founder. If we accept that there were multiple versions of Romulus' story available, and that Romulus as the founder could be seen as embodying the characteristics of the Roman state, Horace here comes down on the side of the worst founder possible. Romulus appears as a negative, rather than a positive, example; at the same time, that negativity is not associated with his role as king. In the seventh *Epode*, Romulus is not a tyrant; fratricide is not one of the stereotypical tyrannical acts, and key words such as *superbia* or *crudelitas* are missing from these lines. Horace does not blame Romulus for being a king. Instead, he recasts the Romulus story as a preview of his own era. It is Romulus' *moral* failing that is at fault in *Epode* 7, rather than any political fault.

The end of the seventh epode offers a mythical precedent for the strife of Horace's own day. The fact that the foundation legend is singled out reiterates the significance of Romulus and Remus, as this story pitted two men of equal status against each other (a situation that arose again in the context of the triumvirs). This struggle is discussed not in the language of political theory, however, nor in terms of kingship, but through mythological allusion. Horace here eschews explicit political language in favor of religious overtones, although political resonance cannot be absent after the opening lines.

It is noteworthy that Romulus is not blamed, as he is in Livy and Cicero, for desiring the kingship. In fact, his regal state is entirely absent from this poem. Horace does not condemn Romulus for wishing to rule alone, but rather for

---

122 Watson 2003:285, citing Cic. *Off.* 3.40–1; for discussion of this passage, see above, pp. 79–81. See further Miles 1995:102 and von Ungern-Sternberg 2006:69.

123 I cannot agree with Kraggerud 1984:58–60 that these closing lines are hopeful, and even less that Remus is meant to symbolize Octavian. See Hierche 1974:51–2 on the purifying quality of civil war; however, Hierche's belief that Horace's Epicurean leanings forbade him from believing that the Romans are driven by fate makes his solution ultimately unsatisfactory. For verbal parallels to these lines, see Carrubba 1966; Mankin 1995:150–2; Watson 2003:283–5. The argument put forward by Robin Bond (2009:135) that "explanations of the causes of the war based on mythic guilt were more palatable to Horace's masters than ones based on competitions for power between factions" is too reductive; Horace was a good enough poet to find a more suitable metaphor, if he had desired one. Such an interpretation implicitly accepts the downdating of *Ep.* 7 to 32.

the fact that he killed his brother. It is difficult to say whether the two could be separated completely; the fact that the kingship is usually mentioned together with the death of Remus (rather than one automatically implying the other) suggests that perhaps they could. If so, Horace offers no commentary on Romulus as a political figure or his desire for rule. This may indicate an increasing acceptance of individual dominance as a solution to internecine strife. Unlike the case of Tiberius Gracchus, or even the abuse lobbed at Cicero, kingship is not enough to condemn a man; murder is.

The *Epode* also goes a step beyond Cicero by making an explicit connection between the fratricide and the civil strife of Horace's own day. Unlike Ennius, Horace does not portray the twins' competition in a positive light. Instead, their rivalry brings about the destruction of the innocent. This includes not only Remus, but also the cursed later generations of Rome. In Horace, then, dyadic rivalry is present, but it is solely negative in value: there is no longer any collegiality in the competition between two elite men at the head of state.

In his later work, Horace abandons the foundation story as a point of reference for Roman politics and instead focuses on the deified Romulus as the founder and therefore model for the city.[124] This change, particularly coming in the later poems, implies a promotion of Romulus' activities: the end, which is the foundation of the city, comes to justify the means. Since Horace's *Odes* were written after the triumph of Augustus, his glorification of Romulus indicates that the dyadic rivalry paradigm should again be understood in a positive light. Romulus' story implicitly argued for the viability of single-man rule in Rome; with Augustus, that state is again a reality. A similar return to the sympathetic depiction of Romulus is visible in other authors of the early Principate.

Conclusion

Although the unsympathetic depiction of Romulus is usually assumed to date back to the late second or early first century, a critical re-examination of the evidence shows that this assumption is inaccurate. Instead, as late as the 60s and 50s BCE in the writings of Catullus and Cicero, Romulus and Remus could be seen in a wholly positive or an ambiguous way. The political use of Romulus in the surviving evidence is at its worst ambiguous. At its best, it can be quite positive: the idealized Romulus of Cicero's *de Re Publica* is lauded as not only a founder, but even a god.

124 Cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.15–16 and 4.8.22–3; Stok 1991:184.

A large part of the problem in understanding Romulus and Remus in the late Republic lies in our lack of evidence. The argument from silence can never be conclusive, but it is suggestive. The discursive pattern I have identified as dyadic rivalry is not stressed, but there is little surviving evidence for the twins. Two points should be emphasized: first, what is notable about the evidence from the mid-first century is the absence not only of the fratricide, but also largely of twinship. When either twin is mentioned, it is alone; yet Remus and Romulus still seem to be interchangeable. This is similar to the twins' equality in Ennius and Hemina, and suggests continuity rather than a break between the 130s and 60s. Second, there is a resurgence of interest in the foundation narrative during and after Caesar's dictatorship. This indicates a connection between leading men and the founder, and at first seems likely to relate to kingship.

But the first surviving condemnation of Romulus is not as a tyrant, but as a murderer. This depiction is first found in Cicero's *de Officiis*, which dates to 44 and seems to be influenced by the civil war between Pompey and Caesar. A similar tone is found in Horace's seventh *Epode*, conventionally dated to the early 30s. This criticism of Romulus is a departure from the second-century tradition that I argued is present in Ennius and Hemina, as well as the polyvalence of the 60s and 50s.

Regardless of his other potential meanings, Romulus could also stand for any Roman. As the founder, he is both model and type. In this situation, his unflattering depiction in the late 40s becomes comprehensible: the intense bloodshed of the triumviral proscriptions and the Perusine war make it likely that the typical Roman would become tainted with murder. Romulus and his story follow suit as Roman authors try to make sense of their situation; other accounts of Romulus from this period, if they existed, have left no trace.

CHAPTER 4

Rites

Ritual is admittedly a problematic category, but it also allows us to see Romulus and Remus in a different light. The very public stage of festivals forced some of the concerns encoded in dyadic rivalry to prominence; others remained in the background, left for the literate elite. The major rituals associated with Romulus and Remus are the festivals of the Lupercalia and Parilia. Our information about these festivals comes from textual sources, and thus the separation of these this chapter from the chronological arrangement of the other chapters requires explanation.

Romulus and Remus lived in a rustic and pastoral world. This was a far cry from the Rome of the writers who imagined them: an urban, Hellenizing city, with monumental buildings and lavish houses on the Palatine, and with continuous construction. It must have been difficult to imagine Rome as it existed before massive city projects such as the Cloaca Maxima or the temples in the Forum area. The festivals that claimed continuity from Romulus' day to the present helped encode those memories and map them onto the city, allowing contemporary Romans to connect with their founder and reminding them of their origins.[1]

The majority of what Romans knew about these festivals is lost to us; we have solely the literary references that survive about them. The reliability of those accounts is problematic for a few reasons. First, not all of the surviving sources are Roman; some may not have personally seen the festivals they describe. In fact, since most authors purport to describe rites as they were practiced by Romulus and Remus, it is quite unlikely that they saw the rites they describe.[2] In other words, it is not clear if these accounts retroject contemporary rituals into the distant past, construct archaizing rituals to match what 'should have'

1 A great deal of work has been done on individual writers' engagement with the city. See e.g. Jaeger 1997; Welch 2005; Rea 2007; Pausch 2008. There has been a lesser degree of interest in the encoding of cultural memory in a Roman festival context, although such mental mapping is known from the Greek world: see e.g. Boutsikas and Hannah 2012, Steinbock 2011. For an example of a ritual approach to a Roman festival, see e.g. Bremmer and Horsfall 1987:76–88 (on the Nonae Caprotinae); Šterbenc Erker 2009 (on the Lupercalia). For the importance of landscape for cultural memory in a modern context, see e.g. Nora 1984 (vol. 1); for the ancient Near East, Assmann 2006.

2 See Scholz 1981:304–10 and Tortorella 2000:244 for changing 'meaning' at the Lupercalia.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_006

occurred in early Rome, or combined the two methods. The latter is perhaps more likely, but we cannot distinguish these layers.

Second, the majority of the references are allusive, rather than descriptive; we thus do not know as much as we might about the actual activities of the festivals. Even if we did, ritual 'meaning' tends to be individualized, rather than collective: two participants at the same festival might not agree on its significance or the reasons behind various acts.[3] It is dangerous to assume that our authors speak for 'Romans' in general. And finally, the works we possess had their own reasons for representing the festivals in a certain way. Generic concerns are one of the more obvious reasons that a work like Ovid's *Fasti* might differ from Livy's history; an individual author's aims and preoccupations, too, might affect what is included and what is omitted.

Nonetheless, two counterpoints to these difficulties make the separate analysis of ritual desirable. These texts provide us with some evidence for activities that could be seen by anyone in Rome at the right time, distancing us from the purely elite material seen thus far.[4] There is obviously a close connection, but the audiences are different. In addition, the appearance of these two festivals in three major and a number of minor sources (largely due to their function as aetiological myths) allows for a synchronic approach. These sources span roughly the last 50 years of the first century BCE, and thus provide a bridge between the triumviral material that I have just discussed and the Augustan-era material that I will discuss in chapter six.

Aetiological myth is a tricky genre. It does not necessarily try to offer a 'real' aetiology (that is, why the Romans started celebrating these rites). Instead, it uses the ritual actions of a given festival as material for learned innovation.[5] These myths are generally interested in single features of a festival, rather than its entirety, and thus cannot be used to reconstruct the full rite. But the reap-

---

3 For example, both Ovid and Livy, despite the fact that they say that the Lupercalia is aimed at increasing fertility, must have known about the rather different use Julius Caesar made of it; they also must have known about Varro's claim that it was a festival of purification. These points are discussed further below.

4 Here I follow Rüpke 2014:251n28: "There are alternatives to textual narrative, even if such narrative is crucial … Ritual can be an important way to dramatically act out the past, in a mode of memorizing or re-presentation. Images can focus on constellations and scenes … or even gain narrative powers."

5 See e.g. Kirk 1972:85–94; Porte 1984; Graf 1993; Pfaff-Reydellet 2008; Calame 2011:2 describes a "'mythico-ritual' rationale … sensitive to the enunciative dimension and the pragmatic aspects of 'myths' that are known to us in poetic form only; these heroic stories gain cultic value and social relevance by means of a poetic performance that is itself ritualized." While Calame is concerned with Athens, his definition holds true for Rome as well when we are speaking of an elite sphere.

pearance of the same key features (namely, running and jumping) in accounts of the Lupercalia and Parilia offer assurance that these actions were part of the rites themselves. Although the mythic explanation need not be very close to the ritual performance, the transmitted actions do play a role.

As a whole, the ritual evidence shows that the political use of the twins that I have argued for in the previous two chapters was not confined to literature.[6] The appearance of similar themes in the literary accounts and ritual actions suggests that the elite patrons of these festivals attempted to broadcast these values to the Roman citizen body as a whole. This broader relevance also supports my argument that these stories were meaningful to more Romans than simply the small group of surviving historians. The Lupercalia, for example, involved the participation of young elite men in a ritual re-enactment of productive competition; these men were frequently either members of the political elite themselves or related to important men in the city's government. A ritual such as this put the concerns encoded in dyadic rivalry onto a public stage. Although not necessarily applicable to the lives of the audience, the Lupercalia and the issues that it addressed were public affairs. Suetonius reports that Augustus made substantial changes to the festival, one of which limited the participants to the equestrian class.[7] This change is indicative of the Lupercalia's relationship to the power struggles of the Republic: the rites were taken away from the elite.[8] Such a relationship is also apparent in the Caesarian reconfiguration of the festival in 44. In addition to adding a third group of *luperci*, Caesar marked his dominance over other Romans by his regal behavior, an issue I discuss in more detail below.

The Lupercalia

The myth of the Lupercalia is a story of Romulus, Remus, and cattle theft. Although it is probable that the mythological tale was a later accretion, by the first century BCE it was accepted as a part of the festival.[9] According to all

6 By 'political use' I mean the shorthand of Romulus and Remus to indicate the key social values of collegiality and fairness in the competitive sphere.

7 See Suet. *Aug.* 31: young men could no longer join the priesthood, perhaps an attempt to limit political activism. Marchetti 2002:89–92 discusses the impact of these changes.

8 Scheid 2008 makes a similar point about the politicization of the Arval brethren.

9 Plutarch (*Rom.* 21) attributes the story to Acilius (*FRHist* 7 F1 = 3 Chassignet = 3 B-W = 2 P = *FrGrHist* 813 F2), which (if accurate) means that the story was current, if not popular, in the mid-second century BCE. For potential problems here, see *FRHist* III.224–6.

mythic accounts, Romulus and Remus are already celebrating the Lupercalia;[10] thus the tale is not an *aition* for the festival as a whole, but solely for the nude race of the *luperci*. In this section, I argue that by the first century, the festival functioned as a ritual re-enactment of dyadic rivalry. Participation in this cult taught elite young men the value of collaboration and reinforced the notion of competition for the benefit of the city. These youths then performed that beneficial competition before the people, demonstrating their understanding of the concept. The Lupercalia provided a safe space for competition, because there was nothing at stake: the festival was already funded by specific *vectigalia* (perhaps dues), and there is no known penalty or reward for the participants.[11] This is not to say that productive competition is the true or only 'meaning' of the festival, but rather that it formed a subtext to the ritual.

The Lupercalia seems to have begun in the Lupercal, the cave where the infants Romulus and Remus were nursed by the she-wolf, and thus automatically provided a topographical link to the foundation myth. But the festival as we know it is defined by the racing of the *luperci*.[12] Roman authors attribute this custom to the need of the twin founders to run after bandits. After a sacrifice, the *luperci* cut the hide of the victim into strips, perhaps girded themselves,[13] and ran around the Palatine/Forum area, hitting spectators. There were usually two groups of *luperci*, called Quincti(li)ani and Fabiani. These seem to be derived from gentilic names, but in the historical period, *luperci* could come from any *gens*.

So much for the actions; the reasons behind them are less clear. Ancient sources disagree on the purpose of the ritual, although all agree that it was very old. Our earliest surviving sources, such as Varro, say that it was a festival of purification;[14] later authors, such as Ovid and Livy, claim that it was a fertility ritual, and that the touch of a *lupercus*' thong would lead to pregnancy for the barren and an easy delivery for women who were already pregnant.[15]

---

10 Livy 1.5; DH 1.80; Ov. *F.* 2.361–80.

11 On the dues, see Cic. *Att.* 12.5.1.

12 According to DH 1.80.1; Ovid says it was the Pelasgians (*F.* 2.281–2). Capdeville 1993:170–6 gives a helpful summary of the testimonia from the late Republic and High Empire, while Fabre-Serris 2013:94–5 analyzes the significance of the Arcadian background to early Rome.

13 The overwhelming majority of first-century sources describe the luperci as *nudi*/γύμνοι; imperial depictions often show them clothed.

14 Varro *LL* 6.13 and 34, *dies februatus*; DH 1.80.

15 Ov. *F.* 2.425–452; Livy 1.5; cf. Gelasius *Adv. Andr.* 12 (citing Livy).

Modern opinions about the purpose of the festival, as ancient, are varied.[16] To a certain degree, this is because they begin from the conflicting information of the sources. As none of these sources has any real claim to primacy, however, I have chosen to approach the Lupercalia from a different angle: what can we learn about the rite by analyzing the myths chosen to explain it? If we accept that "l'étiologie n'est pas une explication definitive" and "dans une religion fondée sur la stricte observation des rites, l'interprétation des pratiques rituelles" requires only "de respecter l'évidence rituelle," the combined analysis of all roughly contemporary accounts is most likely to yield a tangible result.[17] In the three major sources (Dionysius, Livy, and Ovid), the mythic background has been chosen to fit the conception of Romulus and Remus in the first century. The evidence of Dionysius and Livy implies that around the last third of the first century, the Lupercalia myth could be portrayed as an example of productive elite competition. In this tale, Romulus and Remus work together against an external enemy. In contrast, the Ovidian myth shows hints of internal discord.

Dionysius attributes his account to Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, Cato, Piso, and most other historical accounts (τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οἱ πλείους).[18] After being rescued by the she-wolf, Romulus and Remus are adopted by the shepherd Faustulus and become the leaders of the local community. Dionysius then explains how the twins lead their fellows on raids against other herdsmen, including the men of Numitor. This makes Numitor's men angry, and they eventually retaliate, setting up an ambush and capturing Remus. Dionysius then provides two alternatives. The first, which seems to be attributed still to Fabius

16 Purification: Michels 1953, Holleman 1976, Flobert 1983, Harmon 1985, Wiseman 1993, Cornell 1995, Ziolkowski 1999, Blaive 2003. Fertility: Scullard 1981, Harries 1991, Radke 1993, Laurence 2000. Initiation: Dulière 1979, Ulf 1982, Capdeville 1993. A mixture of fertility and purification: Bayet 1969, Holleman 1974, Scholz 1981, Porte 1985, Dumézil 1996, Tortorella 2000; Köves-Zulauf 1990 argues for fertility, purification, and initiatory functions. Other explanations: Sachs 1963 (none given), Holleman 1973 (none given), Parker 1993 (none given), Wiseman 1995a and 1995b (political), Binder 1997 (unimportant; but compare his argument for political significance in 1964), Marchetti 2002 (political). North 2008 has argued that the festival was carnivalesque (for which see Binder 1997:226 and 230), which implies that its primary purpose was to release tension; this could potentially be seen as a political explanation as well, but one that is quite different from other scholars' focus on the bestowal of kingship.

17 Pfaff-Reydellet 2008:103. Cf. Calame 2011:12 for the crucial aid of variants in determining 'meaning'.

18 DH 1.79.1–4; quote at §4. Dionysius' description is discussed in detail by Ulf (1982:30–5), but solely for topographical purposes.

and the rest, is that Romulus is sacrificing at Caenina and Remus is ambushed while alone.[19] This can be interpreted as a sign of Romulus' superiority to Remus (he is more pious) or of Remus' superiority to Romulus (he guards the flocks while Romulus leaves). In this account, which seems to belong to the second century, Romulus and Remus act in concert. Romulus handles the religious obligations, while Remus cares for the animals. This equal relationship fits with the picture of the twins we have already seen in the second-century authors.

Dionysius' second account shows more rivalry. He attributes this second version explicitly to Aelius Tubero, and compliments him as a good historian.[20] This perhaps suggests that Dionysius prefers Tubero's tale to the older stories he has already offered. In this later account, there are a few changes. The twins are both ambushed, and the attack occurs when they are already celebrating the Lupercalia. Three groups of youths are running in the traditional races; Remus, who is in the front, is captured in the ambush and taken before Numitor. This follows the pattern, noted by Wiseman, that Remus the 'slow' twin loses when he tries to act too quickly.[21] But Remus' capture, apparently an unfavorable outcome, in fact yields concrete benefits: Numitor and his grandsons are reunited, and Alba is freed from the tyranny of Amulius. Moreover, it is only a temporary setback even for Remus, as his role in the augury contest is still to come. As we saw in other instances of elite competition, this emphasizes the need for justice: a contest is fair if the loser can hope to win again.

Tubero's agonistic version is clearly influenced by the Lupercalia of 44, which saw the addition of a third group of *luperci*; I will return to this particular celebration below. But it also seems to be the most familiar version in

19 DH 1.79.12–14; I say 'seems' because the attribution is not explicit, but there is also no indication that Dionysius has changed sources. Thus I differ slightly from the approach of the editors in *FRHist* I.15n22. While I agree with their statement that this fragment (Fabius Pictor *FRHist* 1 F4a–b = 7a–b Chassignet = 7a–b B-W = 5 P = *FrGrH* 809 F4) is "a particularly difficult instance" of trying to determine what is original to Fabius and what is a later addition, I believe there may be substantial amounts of non-Fabian material here, which are not marked. See also Plut. *Rom.* 3–8.

20 DH 1.80.1–3; in §1, he calls Tubero δεινὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπιμελὴς ("a man both intelligent and painstaking in his collection of facts"). Here I cannot agree with the suggestion of Oakley (*ad FRHist* 38F3 / III.470; cf. Tubero fr. 4 Chassignet = 4 B-W = 3 P) that this may indicate the continuation of the Julian *luperci* after 44 (contradicting Cicero's evidence at *Phil.* 13.31) and that the remark about the third group of *luperci* is Dionysius' own contribution. See also Ferriès 2009:386–8.

21 Wiseman 1995a:110–111, curiously missing this example.

the 30s and later, because it finds parallels in both Livy and Ovid.[22] The three accounts are not identical; Livy says that Romulus defends himself, not that Remus is winning the race, while Ovid does not include Remus' capture at all. Still, there are three common threads to these versions: first, that the twins are celebrating the Lupercalia; second, that there is a struggle with an enemy (during the cattle theft); and finally, that there is some sort of race. All three of these points are details that may not have been connected to the original festival, but which were present in the first century. I suggest that it is the last point that is most relevant for this period.

The race of Romulus and Remus is ritually re-enacted in the run of the *luperci*, the most characteristic aspect of the festival. It is also an example of risk-free aristocratic competition: although the twins are faced with the external threat of Numitor's herdsmen, there is no internal conflict. Instead, they work collaboratively against this external enemy. In this interpretation, we see that the Lupercalia can be connected to the second-century account of the twins; friendly and productive rivalry is the key theme of the twins' story in that era. The re-enactment of the ritual solidifies this lesson for all of Rome: the runners and the observers alike can see that benefits accrue from a contest that lacks true winners and losers. Whether the Lupercalia was a fertility or purification ritual is, in this sense, irrelevant; it is still productive in that it accomplishes something important for Rome.

The major discrepancy in the sources has to do with what happens to Remus. In Livy and Dionysius, he is taken captive, which makes him, temporarily, the loser in the contest. Here, Romulus and Remus are pitted against each other in a race, and Romulus comes out ahead. This is a similar scenario to what we have in the augury contest. But Romulus' dominance is mitigated by knowledge of the festival. Because the festival recurs yearly, Remus in the narrative has the chance to run again the following year. Thus the competition is fair.

Ovid's story is different. In this account, Remus retrieves the cattle and eats the entire sacrifice, which offers benefits to him and his team alone. Moreover, in Ovid's version the twins are not directly competing. Instead, they cooperate; when the theft of the twins' cattle is announced, each twin *diversis exit uterque / partibus*.[23] The two together cover separate but complementary areas, and 'race' by leaving in different directions. Unlike the race narratives of

22 Livy 1.5.3; strongly implied by Ov. *F.* 2.361–6.

23 Ov. *F.* 2.379–80, "each left in a different direction." Robinson 2011:260 suggests the opposite: it is significant that Ovid alone depicts both twins with partisans.

Dionysius or Livy—and potentially unlike the actual running of the *luperci* at the Lupercalia[24]—in Ovid there is no set route.

Despite the apparent lack of competition in his account, Ovid nonetheless offers the clearest designation of Remus as the winner. When Romulus returns, he finds that his twin has beaten him to the punch and eaten all of the sacrificial meat. This saddens him, although he laughs it off. The laugh has been variously interpreted, but there are two common explanations. The first is that Romulus here realizes that Remus has cursed himself through eating meat meant for the gods. As in the case of his capture, this would be an unfavorable outcome for Remus, and even leads to his death.[25] The second explanation, that the laugh is an indication of a carnival atmosphere of reversal, is more likely.[26] But unlike John North, who argued that this atmosphere was due to the fact that the Lupercalia was a day of reversal itself, I suggest that it actually indicates Romulus' realization of the reversal of the situation Ovid has set up.[27] Ovid's numerous echoes of Ennius in the *Fasti* make it likely that he is playing a clever trick with known accounts of the festival.[28] Here, although the scene started out without direct competition, it has ended up with Remus as the victor. This is an inversion of the productively competitive model seen in the Ennian account of the augury, in which Romulus is the winner. A similar irony may perhaps be reflected in Propertius, whose brief mention of the Lupercalia mentions only one *lupercus*;[29] with only a single couplet, however, it is impossible to be certain. The sole Fabius Lupercus may also be seen as indicating the victory of the Fabiani, as in Ovid;[30] this is Remus' group.

---

24 The question of where the *luperci* ran is still debated; at one time, it was assumed to be the Palatine. Michels 1953, esp. pp. 36–46, suggested the Sacra Via; cf. Wiseman 1995b and Ziolkowski 1999 (Ulf 1982:63–6 argued for a course from the Lupercal to the Forum). This scholarly consensus has been recently questioned by North 2008:148, with note 27 and associated bibliography. Wiseman 2009b:170 implies that the *luperci* ran in all directions at random. The evidence is inconclusive.

25 See e.g. Schilling 1979:112–14 for the curse (*tare originelle*); this interpretation has lost traction as too Christianizing, but is still supported by some (e.g., Marchetti 2002).

26 See e.g. Porte 1984; North 2008:153.

27 Ovid's account of the festival is different enough from others' that is it dangerous to accept it as an accurate depiction of ritual; see, rightly, Harries 1989, although his reading is more ironic than mine; similarly, Robinson 2011:262, "emphasis on the *fama* of this story ... would be typically ironic if Ovid was in fact narrating a version of this tale that was his own invention."

28 See, e.g., Barchiesi 1997:24–6 and 63–4.

29 Prop. 4.1.25–6.

30 See Ov. *F.* 2.372–8.

Ovid's version is regularly taken as more 'accurate', and has been used to support the notion that Remus was originally the more favored twin.[31] Wiseman understands this myth as rewarding Remus' haste (although he is the slow twin), while a number of scholars, following Robert Schilling, have seen the eating of the *exta* as an act of impiety that dooms Remus.[32] Interestingly, though, it is only the writers of the late Republic and early Principate who emphasize the competition between the twins at this juncture. The difference in outcome for Romulus and Remus is stressed by Livy, Dionysius, and (in the end) Ovid. In the imperial period, this will change: Plutarch, if he knows of such competition, ignores it.[33]

The Lupercalia myth, like the augury contest, suggests that competition between the twins could be undertaken without risk and in a cooperative spirit; in these tales, though, this competition goes awry. In Dionysius and Livy, the race of the Lupercalia ends with the capture of Remus at the hands of Numitor's men, destined for severe punishment. Here, the threat is external: although the twins are not at risk from each other, they are threatened by the other herdsmen. Dionysius' version is attributed to Tubero, which reaffirms a likely pro-Republican perspective.[34] In Ovid, on the contrary, there is no external danger. The abrupt change from a non-competitive to a competitive atmosphere, though, is unusual, and suggests that there is an internal risk instead. Remus changes from his originally cooperative behavior and wins at Romulus' expense. This is perhaps a later addition to the legend; it certainly implies that this Ovidian contest is not as benign as the augury contest seen in the first chapter, or even as the Livian and Dionysian versions of the Lupercalia. Instead, this version seems influenced by the Caesarian festival. Unlike Livy and Dionysius, Ovid relates a tale in which the individual has become predominant.

---

31 On Ovid's general trustworthiness in the *Fasti*, see for example Schilling 1966 (reiterated in Schilling 1969) and Blaive 2003. That Ovid was a perceptive observer and accurate recorder of ritual was part of a scholarly trend in the mid-twentieth century and is now being reconsidered; see e.g. Harries 1989, Newlands 1995a, and Feeney 1998. On the episode in general, see Robinson 2011:237–85; diagrammed in Littlewood 1975:1072.

32 Wiseman 1995a:7–8 (with p. 171n36), 1995b:12–13 (=2008b:73–4), incompatible with Tubero's version (in which Remus hurries into a trap; discussed above, pp. 112–13); Schilling 1979 (supported by e.g. Briquel 1990:172); and North 2008.

33 See Plut. *Rom.* 21.7.

34 See e.g. Chassignet 1996:LXXIX–LXXXI; Cic. *Lig.* 9–10, Tubero and his father fought against Caesar.

The Lupercalia of 44

One of the most characteristic features of the Lupercalia was the race of two groups of *luperci*, who—regardless of their original significance—were associated by later writers with Romulus and Remus. In the infamous Lupercalia of 44, Caesar manipulated this association, thereby publicly demonstrating his position in Rome. If the Lupercalia myth showed Romulus and Remus engaged in productive competition against an external enemy, Caesar took advantage of this conception in his own celebration. By altering the festival to include a third eponymous group of *luperci*, he undermined the productive competition that I have argued underlies the Lupercalia and set himself at the head of the contemporary state.

Between 46 and 44, the Roman senate gave Caesar a number of honors about which we are not particularly well-informed.[35] Among them were the right to wear a laurel wreath and other triumphal clothes at all times, two statues (one in the temple of Quirinus, one in front of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus), and a third statue to be carried in public processions; he was also given a new title (*parens patriae*).[36] The motivations behind all actors (senate, Caesar's friends, and Caesar himself) have been extensively analyzed. Most important for the Lupercalia at this time is the question of elite political participation and competition. I will suggest that Caesar's innovations were not as novel as they may seem, although they irritated a subgroup of the political elite.

The year 44 saw two important disruptions of the usual festivities at the Lupercalia. The first was the creation of a new group of *luperci* honoring Caesar, and the second was Antony's attempt to crown Caesar with a diadem.[37] Modern scholarship has been far more interested by the question of the diadem than the new *luperci.* The offer seems to associate Caesar (whether as a willing participant or unwitting bystander) with the tyrannical Romulus we see in later histories such as Livy or Dionysius.[38] Such an association in turn

35 The landmark studies are Weinstock 1971 and Alföldi 1985 (incomplete); a number of more recent works have contributed to the debate. Most notable is the collection of papers in Urso (ed.) 2010.

36 Suet. *DJ* 76.1; App. *BC* 2.106; Dio 43.14.3–6, 43.45.1–3, and 44.4.1–7.3. For the title only, *RRC* 480/19.

37 See Suet. *DJ* 76.1, Dio 44.6.2 for the *luperci*; e.g. Dio 44.11.2–3, App. *BC* 2.109, Cic. *Phil* 2.85–7 for the diadem.

38 Livy 1.16.4; DH 2.56.3–4. Cic. *DRP* 2.20 may know a similar story, but his account refers only to the senate's wish to be acquitted of involvement in Romulus' death.

becomes a question of Caesar's intentions: was Antony's attempt to give Caesar the diadem spontaneous, a means by which Caesar could test the waters, or a way for Caesar to show off with a virtuous refusal?[39] Ancient evidence does not offer an adequate solution; the only contemporary witness, Cicero, implies that Caesar did not want to be king, but he does so in the polemical *Philippics*.[40] Because Cicero's main goal in these speeches is to criticize Antony, the dead Caesar may come off as more innocent than Cicero thought he was while he still lived. As a result, modern attempts to resolve this issue have been largely speculative, based on Caesar's behavior outside of the festival.[41] But by examining the Lupercalia on its own, we can see that Caesar was using the festival to assert his claim to an authority equal to both Romulus' and Remus': like the twins, he was a founder, but not a king.[42] At this point, the question of Caesar's intent seems less relevant: Caesar used the Lupercalia to assert his power in Rome.

Before the festival, Caesar had come to be equated with the founders. Whether the senate's grant of new *luperci* was spontaneous or directed by Caesar is debatable, but Caesar's acceptance of this distinction and supervision of the festivities both indicate that the honors were agreeable to him. The addition of *luperci Iulii* associate Caesar not only with Romulus, but also with Remus. Unlike Augustus' later identification with Romulus through the manipulation of the *spolia opima*, the honors claimed by Caesar were originally shared between the twins.[43] This was almost certainly intended. The addition of the *luperci Iulii* not only strongly associated the dictator with both founders, as has been previously observed,[44] but also eliminated the twins' immediate rivalry by inserting a third party.

The new *luperci* mitigate the ferocity of dyadic rivalry by spreading it more widely. In 44, the rivalry between Romulus and Remus may have seemed too similar to the previous conflict between Caesar and Pompey. The war with the Pompeians was scarcely over, despite Pompey's death; Munda had taken place less than a year earlier, and the decision to add the *luperci Iulii* may have

39 See e.g. Alföldi 1953; Weinstock 1971:331–40; Zecchini 2001:11–34; North 2008; ver Eecke 2008:417–20, with further bibliography on p. 418n312; Luke 2012, again with further bibliography.

40 E.g., Cic. *Phil.* 13.41. See Morstein-Marx 2004:123–6 for a different interpretation.

41 See e.g. Weinstock 1971:318–23 and ver Eecke 2008:408–23. This topic is too vast to be fully examined here; I hope to treat it in a future study.

42 Although Caesar's potential to become a king may have been difficult to ignore, his association with both twins suggests that it was not part of the Lupercalia celebrations.

43 For Augustus, see e.g. Livy 1.10; Prop. 4.10.

44 See e.g. North 2008:157.

been made soon afterwards. The addition thus eliminated a potential parallel between Caesar and Pompey or his sons.

The fact that the new group of *luperci* was named after Caesar underscored his power. *Luperci* are competitors in a city that was rife with conflict. By the addition of new *luperci* honoring him, Caesar presented himself as the solution to the tensions in the city. This spread of rivalry instituted a more idealized system, similar to the early Republic: Caesar presented himself as able to smooth over tension among rivals through his *clementia.* In doing so, he returned the city to a more idyllic phase, like the dictators of old.[45] The other two groups, the *Fabiani* and *Quinctiliani*, were named after very old families and dated back to the earliest period of the festival. Caesar could join them at once and be placed on even footing. This had no precedent—the expansion of priesthoods such as the augurate is not really parallel[46]—and is a striking innovation in a religiously conservative city. The addition of the Julii to one of the oldest festivals in Rome is parallel to Caesar's Alban dress and identification with the family of Aeneas: it showed Caesar as the most recent in a line of important ancestors stretching beyond the foundation of the city.[47] These insertions of the Julian *gens* into the traditions of the Republic are a mark of his importance, but are not particularly novel. We know from Cicero that both Varro and Atticus wrote legendary genealogies of prominent families, and Cicero himself denounces such connections to the city's early history.[48] Caesar's greater prominence has given his claims a more lasting authority, but they are similar to those of his peers in kind.

But Caesar's changes to the Lupercalia did not stop there. Regardless of the earlier significance of the festival, the attempt to crown Caesar while he was presiding over the ceremony gave the Lupercalia of 44 a new and unmistakably regal character.[49] Although North argued that the Lupercalia was primarily carnivalesque and could not have had a political dimension, his account of

---

45 Cole 2013:127–34 argues that Ciceronian oratory makes Caesar's apotheosis contingent upon his ability to achieve this peace.

46 There was no way to distinguish between the augurs whose tenure of office was due to Sulla or Caesar and those whose tenure was long-standing; the *luperci Iulii* make their patron immediately apparent.

47 The bibliography on Caesar and his Alban roots is immense; Smith 2010 provides a starting point. See also e.g. Weinstock 1971:183 and Alföldi 1971:33–4, both with bibliography.

48 Cic. *Att.* 13.40 (with Nepos *Att.* 18); *Brut.* 62 for false claims. See also Drummond's commentary on Atticus' work at *FRHist* III.351–3; on Varro's, III.422–3.

49 The attempt to give Caesar the diadem has a contemporary witness in Cic. *Phil.* 2.85 and 13.31; see also Cic. *Phil.* 3.5 and 12, 13.17–18; further, Quint. *IO* 9.3.61; Plut. *Caes.* 61.3 and *Ant.* 12.1; App. *BC* 2.109; and Dio 44.11.12 and 45.30.1–5.

Caesar's activities there as apolitical is in direct contrast with ancient sources' interpretations of the events of 44.[50] It is not only hostile contemporaries such as Cicero who thought that Caesar (or his supporters) were attempting to re-institute royalty at Rome; later historians made the same claims.[51] If it is indeed true that "Caesar would have had to be out of his senses to use this particular ritual to provide him with a ritual of coronation,"[52] such an idea would not have gained currency in antiquity. The connection had to be plausible, if not accurate, for such claims to be made; Romulus and Remus offer this plausibility. The twins ruled over the shepherds together, according to the most conservative interpretation of Hemina, and contested the right of foundation in Ennius. By putting himself in the same ambit as the patron of his own *luperci*, Caesar implicitly associated his authority with regal power. This becomes more relevant if we recall that the Lupercalia is the moment of decision between the twins: Caesar, as the current *diadoumenos*, surpassed both.

I agree, though, that it is unlikely that the Lupercalia incident was ever meant as a 'coronation ritual'. Mark Toher has argued that Nicolaus of Damascus, who presents the attempt to crown Caesar as a hostile action undertaken by the assassins-to-be, has a more accurate account than has usually been assumed.[53] If this were correct, we have the opposite of intent to rule. The granting of the diadem by the assassins would perhaps move the Lupercalia affair further from Romulus and Remus; instead of desiring regal power, Caesar has it thrust upon him.

Ultimately, though, Toher's argument conflicts with the evidence of Cicero, our sole contemporary observer, who refers only to Antony.[54] The polemic nature of the *Philippics* makes Cicero's account admittedly problematic. He claims that Caesar was right to refuse the diadem, and implies that Caesar's power was acceptable. This statement is unlikely to be indicative of Cicero's true feelings. That Cicero saw Caesar as a king is fairly clear from his correspondence.[55]

50 North 2008, esp. pp. 154–9. See also Toher 2003:141–3 on the event as a precursor to the assassination.

51 E.g., Dio 44.9.1–11.3; Lupercalia at §11.2–3.

52 North 2008:159.

53 Toher 2003. This has not been generally followed; in any case, Nicolaus' information does not alter the outlines of what I argue here, since the differences from the other accounts lie primarily in the identity of those offering Caesar the crown.

54 E.g., Cic. *Phil.* 2.85.

55 E.g., Cic. *Att.* 10.12a.2; 14.10.1; 14.19.2.

The problems with the diadem episode are extensive; other events in the last months of Caesar's life may help to clarify them. The Lupercalia was not the only time that Caesar was associated with kingship. Later sources also mention an attempt to place the diadem on Caesar's statue on the Capitol.[56] This statue was added to a pre-existing statue group of the first six kings and Brutus, the founder of the Republic.[57] The message of the diadem at first seems clear: Caesar was not like Brutus, but rather like a king. But such an interpretation may be misguided. It was only the last king, whose statue was not included in this group, who was usually depicted as a tyrant.[58] The others kings ruled with justice, as we saw in Cicero's *de Re Publica*. This is unlikely to be an idealized view; it is reinforced by the presence of the statues, and by the surviving historical narratives of Dionysius and Livy. Thus the senate's (or Caesar's) intent for this statue may have been the identification of Caesar with a virtuous monarch, rather than a tyrant; it may have aimed to flatter.[59] At the Lupercalia and with the statue, then, we see the association of Caesar with Romulus (and Remus); there is no indication of an automatic association of Romulus and tyranny. The continuing link of Romulus *and* Remus with Caesar in fact indicates that tyranny was not a major message here. When Romulus is a tyrant, it is always as a sole ruler.

Caesar's actions at the Lupercalia, and his regal associations more generally, are more comprehensible in the light of the argument I have been making about dyadic rivalry. As I have suggested above, the addition of the new *luperci* alters the significance of the festival; rather than a re-enactment of elite tension and ultimate cohesion, the Lupercalia of 44 becomes a celebration of peace returning to Rome, courtesy of Caesar. His great deeds win him great honors, as Cicero had suggested was typical of the ideal statesman.[60] He is the living ancestor of his college of *luperci*. Unlike Romulus and Remus or the long-dead ancestors of the Fabii and Quintilii, he watches his men run in his honor. His refusal of the diadem at the same juncture, whether it was offered at his wishes or not, reinforces this message. Caesar did not need a diadem, which

56 Plut. *Caes*. 61.8.

57 See Suet. *Jul*. 76.1; Dio 43.45.3.

58 See e.g. Livy 2.1; Cic. *DRP* 2.47–9.

59 Cf. Sordi 2003: Caesar was trying to align himself with the virtuous and proto-Republican Servius Tullius. Likewise, Giuseppe Zecchini (2001) suggests that Caesar's primary model at this time was the idealized kingship of Servius Tullius as presented in Livy. See also Erskine 1991 for the idea that monarchy at Rome become negative only by the association with eastern monarchs.

60 See Cole 2013 in general, but pp. 111–48 for Cicero and Caesar specifically.

was associated with eastern monarchs in particular, to prove the authority he already held.

By refusing the kingship on multiple occasions, it at first may seem that Caesar denied the association with Romulus that his creation of the Julian *luperci* seemed to require. Indeed, ver Eecke suggested that he purposefully connected himself with Remus.[61] But this is a false dichotomy. The twins were not as strongly differentiated in the late Republic as in later periods; earlier authors emphasize the equality of the twins' relationship. Both twins were associated with the *luperci*, not just Romulus. Caesar did not closely connect himself to either twin. Instead, by the two acts of rejecting the crown and creating the new *luperci*, Caesar indicated that his power was neither monarchic nor the productive competition of the Republic. By creating something new, he showed that he could alter the ideals and norms of the Republic at will. With the *luperci*, he placed himself into one of Rome's oldest festivals; a similar effect was achieved at the equally old, and Romulean, Parilia.

It has been argued that at the Lupercalia, Caesar set forth his own form of government as an alternative to both eastern monarchy and traditional Republicanism.[62] In this sense, the Lupercalia of 44 was a purposeful negation of any tension between the ambitions and power of a great man and the ideals of Republicanism: the two combine in the person of Caesar. In the surviving tales, the twins either separated, with Remus apparently in the role of victor, or they overcame Amulius together. With the addition of the Julian *luperci*, Caesar presents himself as the victor. Like the twins at the festival, Caesar was not a king—but neither was he ready to relinquish power.

The Parilia

Like the Lupercalia, the Parilia was believed to be one of the earliest Roman festivals and seems to have provided fertility through purification. By the late Republic, it was also considered Rome's birthday, although this is not indicated by the ritual program. Moreover, although ancient authors agree that the date itself (April 21) is Rome's birthday, Romulus and Remus are not connected with the festival outside of Ovid. This absence may indicate a desire to suppress

61 ver Eecke 2008:421; she connects this to the argument of Wiseman 1995a for the original superiority of Remus to Romulus. Remus is thus the victorious twin.

62 The bibliography on this is vast. See e.g. Zecchini 2001:30–3: the Lupercalia becomes "la festa di fondazione di una nuova era per la repubblica" (p. 30) and offers a new type of solution to the problems facing the state.

the twins' pacific relationship at a period of strife, but it is more likely to be a reminder that the founders were complex figures. Their association with the Parilia did not need to come through myth, but may have been made on the strength of its rural nature. The Parilia is a festival of shepherds; the founders were shepherds, too. The ritual thus reminds its celebrants of the city's earliest days.

The ancient sources on the Parilia treat it as a celebration of bucolic simplicity.[63] They share only two points in common: that the festival was dedicated to Pales, and that it involved leaping over heaps of burning hay.[64] In addition, the majority of our information comes from short references, rather than extensive treatments. These sources are also relatively late, although even the earliest accounts stress that the Parilia marks the city's foundation date.[65] Aside from this, however, they provide little information; most are interested in the potential etymology of the odd name, rather than the rite.[66]

Most Augustan evidence presents the Parilia as an ancient shepherds' festival. This is achieved differently by different authors; Tibullus, for example, does not offer details beyond a vignette of the festivities, which fits with his general rusticity.[67] In poem 2.5, in honor of Messallinus, he expounds the prophecy of the Sibyl as part of a miniature *Aeneid*.[68] The twins appear early in the poem, as a marker of what has not yet occurred: *Romulus aeternae nondum formav-*

63 E.g., Prop. 4.1.17–20; Tib. 1.1.33–6 and 2.5.87–90.

64 The Parilia is attested briefly in numerous literary sources, as well as several calendars. For the Republic and the Augustan era, the major testimonia are Varro, *RR* 2.5.1 and *LL* 6.15; Prop. 4.1.17–20 and 4.4.73–8; Tib. 1.1.33–6 and 2.5.87–90; Ov. *F.* 4.721–862; and Festus 248L (assuming that this goes back to Verrius Flaccus). Vangaard 1971 provides a partial list of sources; Gjerstad 1976 is more complete. Beard 1987 argues for the accumulation of meanings at the festival. The comment of Capdeville 1993:179n146 that "cette fête est abondamment attestée" is slightly disingenuous; we actually have little information about what occurs there. See similarly Miller 1991:125–6, arguing that the numerous references to the Parilia show its importance.

65 Varro *RR* 2.5.1; *Fasti Ant.*, 21 April.

66 See Varro, *LL* 6.15, Palilia (although he elsewhere calls it Parilia) and, in modern scholarship, the exhaustive study of Marcos Celestino 2002, who connects both the Parilia and Pales to the Palatium (where the rite may have originated).

67 See Tib. 2.5.87–90. His second book of elegies is usually dated to c. 19 BCE, roughly contemporary with the *Aeneid*. His outlook is usually considered fairly pro-Augustan (see Maltby 2002b:41–55), but as I will argue, there are nonetheless some darker themes.

68 For the connection between the Tibullan Sibyl and Vergil's, see e.g. Buchheit 1965; Lyne 1998; Arena 2005. Cardauns 1961 uses Varro to identify this Sibyl with the Cumaean Sibyl, as in Vergil; *contra*, Cairns 1979:76–7n69; Maltby 2002a. Murgatroyd 1994:165 calls this "an extremely learned poem", while Lee-Stecum 2000:199–201 argues that the nested texts

erat urbis / moenia, consorti non habitanda Remo.[69] Here, the fact that Remus was barred from the city is presented gently, in keeping with the hymnic nature of Tibullus' verse. The couplet emphasizes the fact that Romulus is founding the *eternal* city, and by placing *aeternae* beside the founder's name, alludes to his own immortality. The superiority of one twin is thus clear. Yet although this break between the twins is addressed, Remus is still clearly his brother's companion (*consors*),[70] a hint at the balance and equality that we have seen in other accounts. The poem is often read as a joyful celebration of the return of felicity.[71] Yet there is a darker note here as well. Sibylline prophecy is ambiguous, and Tibullus' text leaves Remus' role open. The *non* can be taken with both *consors* and the verb: Remus is not Romulus' *consors*, nor will he be permitted to live in Rome (or indeed at all).

When Tibullus reaches the festival itself, the connection with fertility is made more apparent:

> ac madidus baccho sua festa Palilia pastor
> concinet: a stabulis tunc procul este lupi.
> ille levis stipulae sollemnis potus acervos
> accendet, flammas transilietque sacras.
> et fetus matrona dabit, natusque parenti
> oscula comprensis auribus eripiet,
> nec taedebit avum parvo advigilare nepoti
> balbaque cum puero dicere verba senem.[72]

---

confound Tibullus' reader's understanding of history. See also Santangelo 2013:149–73 on Sibylline prophecy in Rome.

69 Tib. 2.5.23–4, "Romulus had not yet founded the walls of the eternal city, in which Remus his companion was not to dwell." Murgatroyd 1994 and Maltby 2002b *ad loc*. both note that this is the first appearance of the phrase *urbs aeterna*; it is appropriate for the Parilia's sense of rebirth.

70 See Murgatroyd 1994 and Maltby 2002b, both *ad loc.*, for the ambiguity of *consors*; I would add that there is a note of irony here. Particularly in the context of Sibylline prophecy, *consors* can read as "sharer of fate" (*con-sors*); as we know, Remus will *not* share Romulus' fate of apotheosis, just as he will *not* dwell in the same city.

71 See e.g. Cairns 1979:84; Murgatroyd 1994 *ad loc.*; Maltby 2002a:297.

72 Tib. 2.5.87–94, "And the shepherd, sodden with wine, will sing at his feast, the Parilia: then, wolves, keep far from the fold! Drunk, he will ignite the piles of light straw in accordance with the rite and jump over the sacred flames. And the matron will give birth, and the child will snatch kisses from his parent, holding his ears, and it will not bore the grandfather to watch over his tiny grandson, an old man speaking nonsense with the boy."

First we see what appears to be a prayer for the safety of the flocks. Although on the surface this has little to do with the foundation, in the context of a story about Romulus, the wolf is a reminder of the she-wolf that saved the founders. This wish marks a distinction between the Romulean world and Tibullus' own; although the wolf was helpful then, she is harmful now. The prayer also recalls Horace's comparison of contemporary Romans to wolves in *Epode* 7, although with a more hopeful message. In Horace's poem, the wolf is gentler than the Romans; in Tibullus', it is a savage beast that must be kept away. Yet the idyll is not perfect. The shepherd and wolf show tension because they are natural enemies, but we must remember that Romulus, the city's original shepherd, was in some ways also wolfish. At the foundation, these two enemies lived in harmony. Tibullus' world, while pastoral, is more realistic than myth.

Both Paul Murgatroyd and Robert Maltby suggested that this section of the poem could be read either as a poetic rendition of an actual prayer, or as an authorial comment on the drunkenness of the shepherd.[73] A drunk shepherd is not able to scare the wolf away from his animals. This explanation offers a connection to Propertius 4.4, and is attractive; I will return to it below. The shepherd's inebriated state is picked up in the next line, indicating that drunkenness was a significant part of the ritual for Tibullus. The poem continues with a contrast between the idyllic scene of the shepherd's family and the mention of Romulus and Remus at the beginning of the poem. The founders were abandoned by their family, have no parents, and ultimately fight with each other.[74] Tibullus' ideal family enjoys spending time together. The Sibyl's prophecy shows more hope for Rome's future. As the next lines, about lovers' quarrels and Tibullus' own broken heart, make clear, however, the twins are more accurate models for elegiac life.

Propertius offers an only slightly fuller account, but one that hints at a darker message. He gives two brief descriptions of the Parilia, one in the general overview of archaic Rome (4.1) and the other set against the background of Tarpeia's treachery (4.4). The first acts mainly as a marker of the Roman piety

73 Murgatroyd 1994 and Maltby 2002b, both *ad loc.*; Maltby prefers the latter explanation, while Murgatroyd prefers the prayer.

74 Arena 2005:366 may go too far in classing Tibullus' depiction of Romulus as an "*impius Aeneas*". Tibullus makes the contrast between current and past Parilias clear, but this need not preclude an apologetic view towards Romulus; see Lee-Stecum 2000 for the multiplicity of meanings in Tibullus' text (although n.b. p. 182, where she suggests that Tibullus' second book shows continuity with the past). See also Murgatroyd 1994:163–225 and Maltby 2002b:430–64 for the variety of readings possible at various points in this poem.

that continues from early Rome to Propertius' own day. He begins the poem, like Tibullus with an echo of the *Aeneid*, by describing the early city to a visitor: *hoc, quodcumque vides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est.*[75] The address to a visitor is important for the presentation of the Parilia that follows. After a list of various monuments on the Palatine, Propertius describes the ritual associated with the city's foundation:

> nulli cura fuit externos quaerere divos,
>   cum tremeret patrio pendula turba sacro,
> annuaque accenso celebrante Parilia faeno,
>   qualia nunc curto lustra novantur equo.
> Vesta coronatis pauper gaudebat asellis,
>   ducebant macrae vilia sacra boues.[76]

Like the Tibullan account, this description of the Parilia stresses its rural and simple nature. The ritual activity of lighting piles of straw appears in both accounts; in Propertius alone is the description followed by the rites of Vesta. This series, Parilia and Vesta, is repeated in poem 4.4. Here, the festival sharply differs from the description found in Tibullus; the presence of Tarpeia adds a new dimension. In Propertius' idiosyncratic retelling,[77] the story of Tarpeia's treachery takes place on Rome's anniversary:

> urbi festus erat (dixere Parilia patres),
>   hic primus coepit moenibus esse dies,
> annua pastorum convivia, lusus in urbe,[78]

75 Prop. 4.1.1, "This, stranger, all that you can see, is what makes Rome great." I have used the Oxford text with comparison to Richardson 1977 throughout. On the significance of *hospes* here for Propertius' orientation in book 4, see e.g. Weeber 1978 and T. Welch 2005:8–9; I will return to other aspects of this important poem in chapter six. Book 4 is usually dated to 16 BCE, and shares important connections with Tibullus; see e.g. Maltby 2002a.

76 Prop. 4.1.17–22, "They had no interest in seeking out foreign gods, since the hesitant crowd shook at their ancestral rite, such as the annual Parilia celebrated with lit straw. The purification is now renewed by a shorn horse. Impoverished Vesta once rejoiced on her garlanded asses: the consecrated animals were leading her inexpensive rites." Weeber 1978:495–6 connects this description with Evander's account of the foundation of the Ara Maxima (Verg. *Aen.* 8.172–4), which Propertius will relate in poem 4.6.

77 For the individuality of this account, see e.g. T. Welch 2005:56–78 and Rea 2007:113–18; Fraschetti 2004 and Nau 2009 emphasize the theme of *felix culpa*.

78 On this problematic line, see Butrica 2000; his emendations do not affect my argument.

cum pagana madent fercula divitiis,
cumque super raros faeni flammantis acervos
traicit immundos ebria turba pedes.
Romulus excubias decrevit in otia solvi
atque intermissa castra silere tuba.
hoc Tarpeia suum tempus rata convenit hostem:
pacta ligat, pactis ipsa futura comes.
mons erat ascensu dubius festoque remissus
nec mora, vocalis occupat ense canis.
omnia praebebant somnos: sed Iuppiter unus
decrevit poenis invigilare suis.[79]

Again we see the hallmarks of the Parilia: it is a rite of shepherds and a time of fun and games. The ritual is celebrated by consuming wine and leaping over burning piles of straw. But there are important differences with the addition of Tarpeia to the story. Because the Parilia is so distracting, Tarpeia is able to meet with Titus Tatius and let him in with his army. Romulus has failed as a leader; no one is guarding the city.

Here, we see the ironic reversal of Tibullus' prayer. Tibullus had hoped that the wolf would stay away from the sheep, keeping natural enemies separate. Tarpeia reconceptualizes Romulus as a wolf (lines 53–4), returning him to his usual role as a fostered baby. But although Romulus is the wolf, it is Titus Tatius who attacks the stronghold like a predator. In Propertius' account of the Parilia, the wolf is the besieged victim.

Tarpeia's actions in admitting Titus Tatius break the wishes laid out in Tibullus' prayer; he is the enemy. Her offense may be lessened, however, by her suggestion that Romulus is a wolf among humans. Moreover, she is only able to betray the citadel because of the drunkenness of those who are supposed to be on guard. This too refers back to Tibullus' prayer, and makes Romulus' indulgence in granting leave seem foolhardy. Indeed, Propertius' poem

79 Prop. 4.4.73–86, "There was a festival in the city—the fathers called it 'Parilia'—this day marked the first beginning of the walls. It was an annual feast of shepherds, rejoicing in the city, when country wagons drip with riches, and when the drunken crowd leaps its dirty feet over intermittent piles of burning straw. Romulus ordered the guards to disperse in leisure and the camp to be silent with the horn-blasts suspended. This was the moment Tarpeia chose to meet her enemy: the compact bound her to be the companion of those with whom she treated. The hill was difficult to ascend and abandoned because of the festival; with no delay, he (Tatius) ran through the barking canines with a sword. Everyone was asleep, but Jupiter alone determined to keep watch, with his own punishments."

undercuts Romulus' leadership throughout; even the relatively innocuous line 85 alludes to previous ideas of Romulus and Romulean leaders as the *unus homo*.[80] Propertius' *unus homo* is actually a *deus*, Jupiter.

Propertius' line of thinking should be contrasted with Cicero's: in the *Catilinarians* and *de Re Publica*, men have the potential to become gods when they save the state.[81] In Propertius' poem, only actual gods have the power of salvation; men are helpless against even the forces of a single woman, Tarpeia. Granted, this Tarpeia is not a typical Roman woman; she is a Vestal virgin (lines 17–18).[82] Her status may make her more sympathetic to the reader; it also recalls the Parilia scene of 4.1, and invites the reader to compare the two descriptions of the festival. In 4.1, the rite was an indication of Rome's ancient piety and purity. In 4.4, in contrast, the festival memorializes a city under attack. Rome is captured on account of the treachery of its priestess and the incomptence of its leader.

Unlike the sanitized version of the Parilia that Propertius presents to visitors, the inhabitants of the city receive a stark reminder of their vulnerability. This offers a new angle on the memory of the festival: no longer a celebration of bucolic fertility, it is here a reminder of dissent and war.[83] Tarpeia, who betrays her city, is explicitly blamed at the end of the poem (line 94), but she is not the only one at fault.[84] The founder, who ought to be protective of Rome, is too indulgent, leaving an opening for Tarpeia's cunning. Her love for Titus Tatius is greater than Romulus' love for his city.

The contrast between the face Propertius shows at the outset of his book and that displayed further in is telling. The opening elegy stresses that it is meant for a stranger; this is not the same story that the Romans hear (given in 4.4). Propertius elsewhere expresses the distress that Rome's civil strife had caused him.[85] The change that we see here between the peaceful aspects of this festival and its darker side problematizes even the most bucolic of Rome's festivals. It draws attention to the Augustan claim to have restored the Republic, and to Augustus' self-association with Romulus as king, by pointing to the

80 Potential allusions to (e.g.) Enn. *Ann.* 54 Sk.; Cic. *Cat.* 3.22; for the motif, see Farrell 2013:57.

81 E.g., Cic. *Cat.* 3.22; 3.29, men work with the gods. See also above, p. 68–69.

82 This follows Varro *LL* 5.41, a typically unelaborated etymology of the Tarpeian rock. For the significance of the Vestals in Rome, see e.g. Beard 1980; Parker 2004; on Tarpeia as Vestal, T. Welch 2005.

83 Here again Propertius' retelling contrasts with Tibullus', where the Sibyl's prophecy relates a celebratory mood.

84 This reading contrasts with T. Welch 2005, who sees Tarpeia as a sympathetic embodiment of the problematic division between individual and state.

85 E.g., Prop. 1.22.

founder's fallibility. Finally, Propertius insinuates that behind the beatific Rome of Augustus' rebuilding program—the first thing visible to strangers—lies a darker history.

Unlike the spare accounts of Propertius and Tibullus, Ovid provides a long account of the foundation of the city.[86] He is the only writer to make an explicit link between the twins and the festival. This does not imply that Ovid is relating the 'real' link between Romulus, Remus, and the Parilia; as I have mentioned, Ovid's aetiologies are more complex than that. Instead, Ovid has focused on one major aspect of the festival and found a Roman myth that matched that aspect. This is the same technique that he uses to link the Lupercalia to the Romulean past, and it is probable that he would follow the same method here. The most characteristic ritual aspect of the Lupercalia was the running of the *luperci*; the Parilia, as we have seen, was characterized by jumping over bonfires. Ovid's task in writing the section on the Parilia in the *Fasti*, then, was to find a Roman historical parallel for the act of leaping. Such a parallel led him to the story of Rome's foundation. Yet this was not implausible, as reference to a primeval period in Roman history only underlined the festival's age and thus reinforced the likelihood of the aetiology's accuracy and relevance.[87] Moreover, the connection of the Parilia with the city's birthday itself strengthened the aetiology. Just as the nudity and running of the *luperci* could be explained by the twin founders' attempts to recover their cattle, the act of leaping could be explained by reference to Remus' leap over the wall.

Because Ovid's account of the Parilia is a retelling of the foundation story, it is at this point that he accounts for the death of Remus. This event is missing from all other accounts of the festival.[88] Ovid explicitly absolves Romulus from complicity in Remus' death. This marks a change that I think can be attributed to Ovid's Augustan setting, a point which I will argue in greater detail when I return to the death of Remus in chapter six.

In addition to poets, the Parilia attracted at least one politician: Julius Caesar. This offers a potential parallel to his revision of the Lupercalia, although it has drawn much less scholarly attention. Most modern opinions of Caesar's

86 Ov. *F.* 4.801–58 deals specifically with the foundation; lines 721–862 treat the Parilia as a whole.

87 See Porte 1985:309 on the use of historical tales to strengthen aetiologies; Harries 1989 discusses the importance of Ovid's authority in his tales.

88 It is implied by Tib. 2.5.23–4, but Pales does not appear until line 28, and the Parilia itself until line 87; thus the connection of Remus' death with the festival is far from clear. Similarly, Prop. 4.1.49–50 hints at the death of Remus, but not in the context of the Parilia, which is discussed at lines 19–20.

actions at the Parilia are in broad agreement. Stefan Weinstock put forward two suggestions for the political significance of the Parilia. He argued that Caesar asserted his political power at the Parilia of 45 in two ways: first, by delaying the announcement of the victory at Munda, and second by including his statue in the procession of the gods.[89] But this argument is far from certain. The delay in announcing the Munda victory may have been due to Caesar's planning, but travel in the ancient world could be held up for many reasons.[90] Without further evidence, it is difficult to say that this delay was deliberately planned. This is particularly true as there seems to be no reason why Caesar would benefit by announcing this victory for the first time at the Parilia. Weinstock's explanation, that the announcement of the victory would further Caesar's aim of being associated with Romulus, is problematic, as he himself notes that this would have been achieved regardless of the victory.[91] The refoundation of Rome, the sole purpose of the association, need not occur on its original foundation date. Subsequent claims of refounding the city did not try to align the 'original' date of foundation. Munda, then, seems only incidental to the Parilia of 45, and Weinstock rightly treats this material as secondary.[92]

Ver Eecke additionally suggested that Propertius takes Caesar's refoundation of Rome one step further by setting the treason of Tarpeia at the Parilia.[93] Thus the foundation of Rome is reaffirmed yet again: not only by the Julian analogue of Munda, but also by the Romulean analogue of Titus Tatius. This is possible, but I think it more likely that Propertius placed Tarpeia's treachery at the Parilia to underscore the wars *after* Caesar, as discussed above. He may also have chosen to set the treason at this point for more artistic reasons. In Livy's account of the Sabine women, they are seized at a festival, the Consualia; it is a neat parallel for Propertius to set the Sabine invasion of Rome during a festival as well.[94] There are a number of similarities between the Consualia and Parilia: both took place on the same day of the month and both had multiple celebrations.[95] Propertius' evidence may then be more an example of Alexandrian wit than Caesarian patriotism.

---

89 Weinstock 1971:175 and 184; followed by ver Eecke 2008:406–8. For the victory at Munda, see e.g. *CAH*[2] vol. 9, ch. 11 [Wiseman]; Ferrary 2010:17–22 (on the subsequent honors only); Scullard 2010:121–6; [Caes], *Bell. Hisp*.

90 Noted but dismissed by Weinstock 1971:176.

91 Weinstock 1971:176.

92 See Weinstock 1971:184–6 on the Parilia.

93 ver Eecke 2008:408.

94 Livy 1.9.6–10.

95 Both are eight days after the Ides, according to the *Fasti Antiates*. In addition to its April celebration, there was a Parilia in July; the Consualia was celebrated in both August and December.

The issue of the procession is more problematic, because Caesar would then be equating himself with the gods. I will discuss this question more thoroughly below, in the section on Quirinus; a few words should be said about it here, however. Divine honors, like those given to Caesar, showed a certain degree of political authority.[96] These had a Republican prototype in Scipio Africanus, as Weinstock pointed out.[97] I do not think that the evidence can bear the weight of an equation of Quirinus and Caesar at the Parilia; the only contemporary evidence for this procession is Cicero, who calls Caesar *hunc de pompa Quirini contubernalem*.[98] This indicates that Caesar was in the procession, but not necessarily as "an ivory statue in the company of Romulus-Quirinus."[99] There is no indication that Cicero is thinking of the Parilia. Indeed, Caesar's statue seems to have accompanied all processions, and Cicero's remark is more pointed if it is more general.[100] The use of *contubernalis* may also imply that Cicero was purposefully conflating the statue in the procession with Caesar's statue in Quirinus' temple, an honor he has already joked about to Atticus.[101] The later testimony of Dio mentions the statue in the context of the honors of 45, but again, not the Parilia in particular. Dio also does not indicate a closer connection with Quirinus than any of the other gods: ἀνδριάντα αὐτοῦ ἐλεφάντινον … μετὰ τῶν θείων ἀγαλμάτων πέμπεσθαι ἔγνωσαν.[102]

From the evidence it is clear that in 45 the senate offered Caesar a statue in a procession. This decree gave Caesar quasi-divine honors, as did the statue in Quirinus' temple and his *flamen*, but it did not associate him more closely with Romulus than the other gods. Dio, for example, claims that Caesar's statue was inscribed "Jupiter Julius", indicating a very different association.[103] Even Cicero's contemporary evidence only hints at a close association of Caesar and Romulus at this time. The relevance of the statue in a procession at the Parilia was only incidental. The presence of Caesar, a living man, in a procession of the gods would have had a similar impact at a different festival.

---

96 And see above, pp. 68–69, on the association of divinity and salvation of the city, which supports a connection between Caesar's honors and Munda rather than the honors and the Parilia.

97 Weinstock 1971:110 and 185.

98 Cic. *Att.* 13.28.3, "this companion of Quirinus at the procession"; cf. Dio 43.45.2.

99 Weinstock 1971:185.

100 See e.g. Dio 44.4.4–6.3 for a list of honors; the discussion of Fishwick 1987:56–72 offers a succinct summary of the varied opinions on Caesar as a god.

101 See e.g. Cic. *Att.* 12.48.

102 Dio 43.45.2, "[the senate] decreed that an ivory statue of him be sent with the statues of the gods." On this statue, see Fishwick 1975; Koortbojian 2013:87–91.

103 Dio 44.6.4.

Although the Parilia's association with the foundation of the city ought to have made it a good source of political capital, our sources present it as a non-elite ritual. Our lack of information may simply be due to survival; it is possible that the rustic nature of the festival made it a less suitable source of political prestige than (for example) the Lupercalia. The foundation myth was associated with the twins in their role as shepherds, not kings; this was perhaps not a period in their life that the political elite wished to emulate. Similarly, the bonfires and bucolic setting provide a less appropriate of Caesar's statue. Although this may have occurred at the Parilia, it is not an isolated instance and was not in itself sufficient to equate Caesar with Romulus. The existence of a number of similar links between Caesar and Romulus (or Quirinus) reinforced Caesar's alleged claim to be a new founder. A closer examination of the connection between Caesar and Quirinus is thus warranted.

Quirinus

One of Caesar's last acts was the placement of his statue in the temple of Quirinus.[104] This was not without earlier Republican precedent, as has been pointed out before,[105] and may be connected with the inclusion of his statue in the procession after Munda.[106] Taken together, these events have been seen as a coherent Caesarian program of identification with Quirinus. 'Identification' is a strong word in this context, and I argue below that 'association' is a more accurate and likely term. Caesar would not necessarily want to equate himself with Quirinus or the founder, but rather to present himself as a new and better model.[107] Much as Cicero presented himself as the successor to Romulus in the *Catilinarians*, Caesar's actions show that he deserved divine honors for his service to Rome.

---

104 Cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.45.2–3.

105 Alföldi 1971:38; Weinstock 1971:171 and 188. The godlike depiction of an elite Roman was also possible during the earlier Republic, even in Rome; see e.g. Tanner 2000:41–5, esp. p. 44. This background is downplayed rather strongly by Cole 2013.

106 See Weinstock 1971:185 and above, pp. 111–112.

107 This is similar to the argument made for Caesar's kingship; see e.g. sources and discussion in Fishwick 1987:56–72 and Luke 2012. See also e.g. Smith 2007 and Miles 1988 for the idea that subsequent founders improve upon the faults of Romulus in Livy's history.

Such honors were not unheard-of in the Republic, although they were also not typical. They are a major topic in *de Re Publica* 6, and are moreover in some ways similar to the *imagines* of elite families. In Caesar's case, however, there are two major differences: first, there is some question as to whether he became divine while still alive; and second, his cult was not limited to the Julii, but extended to all of Rome. The second change assimilates Caesar to the founder, while the first (if accurate) would allow him to surpass Romulus as a god on earth. The idea of an improved Romulus is similar to Caesar's one-upmanship at the Lupercalia, and cannot be fully ruled out.[108] Such divinity both supports my earlier contention that Caesar was more interested in regal power than the regal title and suggests a reason why Cicero, at least, turned against Romulus in the *de Officiis.*

Quirinus had a long history at Rome, as his possession of a *flamen* suggests.[109] His duties were primarily protective; much like the archaic Mars, he appears as a defender of fields and flocks. Ancient sources attribute the introduction of Quirinus to the king Titus Tatius.[110] The god is thus doubly linked to Romulus: once via his co-ruler Tatius, and again by his role alongside Mars. Indeed, 'Quirinus' could appear as an epithet of Mars, as well as a deity in his own right.

The earliest evidence for the identification of Quirinus and Romulus comes from the late Republic. Cicero makes the identification explicit, and the pediment of Quirinus' temple (discussed in the next chapter) depicts the augury scene. Before that period, the identity is not assured, or at least not consistent. In Ennius' *Annales*, Romulus addresses a prayer to Quirinus;[111] this seems to imply that the two were separate, or at least that Quirinus existed before Romulus' own deification. The Romulus tradition, though, had not been solidified in Ennius' day. As we have seen, Ennius and his contemporaries had a different view of Romulus than was current in the first century, and their

---

108 In addition to the works cited above, nn. 39 and 51, see also Geschke 1968; Flower 1996, especially pp. 60–90 for display of *imagines*; Wardle 1997:336–43, with bibliography; Rosenblitt 2011:424.

109 See e.g. Dumézil 1996:686–9.

110 For Quirinus' origin, see Varro *LL* 5.73 and Ov. *F.* 2.477–8. See also the lucid discussion of ver Eecke 2008:382–8 on the difficulties of distinguishing the pre- and post-Caesarian Quirinus.

111 Enn. *Ann.* 99 Sk.

accounts of Romulus were not univocal.[112] As a result, the fact that Ennius makes Romulus separate from Quirinus cannot be taken as evidence that no one equated the two.[113] In fact, Ennius may also have depicted Romulus' apotheosis.[114] Although modern scholarship still debates the best interpretation of these lines, it is clear that Romulus is addressed as a demigod and the father of his country.[115] It is not clear that Ennius identified Romulus and Quirinus, but it is quite clear that Romulus' status was different from an ordinary mortal's. It is possible that Romulus could have eventually become a god himself, but it must be stressed that such divinity is not found in the remains of the text.

By Cicero's day, the identification was sealed.[116] Walter Burkert argued that Caesar was the first to make this connection; but the fact that Cicero uses Romulus as an example of a deified human in the *de Re Publica* leads me to believe that this was not the case.[117] In the 50s and in a philosophical dialogue, Cicero did not need to toe the Caesarian party line. Instead, we should see the deification of Romulus here as an example of his virtue, as Cicero himself states: unlike the deified heroes of the Greeks, learned men chose to raise Romulus to a seat amongst the gods.[118] This fits in with Cicero's generally favorable depiction of Romulus in the *de Re Publica*.

This laudatory depiction of Romulus, though, is incompatible with his later condemnation of the founder, although Cicero is careful to point out that Quirinus and Romulus are the same.[119] Caesar's broadening association with Quirinus is a likely source of Cicero's change of opinion from the *de Re Publica*.

---

112 See below, pp. 181–182, on the differences between Ennius and Fabius Pictor.

113 See von Ungern-Sternberg 1993:104 for a fair defense of the idea that Romulus and Quirinus were identified even in Ennius' day. This early identification has been supported by many others, for example Schilling 1979:107, but has not met with universal acceptance (see Barchiesi 1997:113, with bibliography in n. 11; Cole 2006; Elliott 2013:179).

114 Enn. *Ann.* 105–8 Sk., *'o Romule Romule die / Qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt! / O pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum!'* ("O Romulus, shining Romulus, what a guardian of the country the gods have brought forth in you! Father, progenitor, descended from divine blood!")

115 Enn. *Ann.* 111 and 116–17 Sk. Skutsch himself did not think that Romulus and Quirinus were the same; see Skutsch 1985:245–7 (on line 99).

116 See Cic. *Leg.* 1.3; *DRP* 2.17–19.

117 Burkert 1962, now a less popular view. This issue is discussed at length in Cole 2013 (see esp. pp. 85–103 on *DRP* 2), with similar conclusions to those I draw here. He attributes more impact to Cicero's view than I think likely.

118 Cic. *DRP* 2.18.

119 Cic. *Off.* 3.41, *Peccavit igitur, pace vel Quirini vel Romuli dixerim* ("so he did wrong, whether I call him Quirinus or Romulus").

In the dialogue, Romulus is praised as an ideal king because—among other things—he institutes the senate, thus sharing his royal power. By this partial delegation of authority, Romulus shows that he has the city's interests at heart, not his own. In the *de Officiis*, in contrast, Romulus cannot share power even with his brother, much less with the Roman elite. Cicero makes it clear that in doing so, Romulus reveals that he has his own best interests at heart, not Rome's; this act is *utile*, but not *honestum*. The murder of Remus shows how deeply Romulus has invested in his own advancement and ambition at the expense of others.

Although Caesar had been in power during the writing of the *de Re Publica* as well, there were changes between c. 54 and 44. First, in the late 50s his power was still shared. The political elite, Cicero among them, may have disliked the domainance of Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus, but they tolerated the trio more than they would tolerate Caesar's sole *dominatio*. Over the course of this decade, Rome saw the collapse of that power-sharing, first through the death of Crassus, and then the war with and death of Pompey. Although Caesar was not to directly to blame for either of these deaths, it may have seemed that he was more interested in sole than joint authority. His choice to triumph for victories over fellow citizens would have underscored this impression, particularly if the triumphs were as vivid as later sources suggest.[120] Similarly, his association with Quirinus may have refracted his political position onto Romulus. A single event did not cause the change in depictions of Romulus in the late 40s; it was the accumulation of actions.

Indeed, Cicero had lamented the struggle over the Republic in letters to Atticus since the early 40s.[121] The depiction of Romulus as a selfish and harsh founder is unlike what we find elsewhere in the late Republic and seems intended to clash with Caesar's own self-fashioning as a merciful leader. Such criticism was hard to speak openly, even after the assassination.[122] Romulus-Quirinus offered a good proxy, much like Cicero's use of Greek and code names in his letters; as we saw in Catullus, the founder's status made him a model for all Romans, not just Caesar. Since Cicero's despair for the lost Republic had been long-lasting and continued even after the assassination, he turned to a more broadly-applicable example. Unlike 'Caesar', 'Romulus' continued

120 E.g., Dio 43.8.4; App. *BC* 2.101.

121 E.g., Cic. *Att.* 10.7.1 (Pompey and Caesar are fighting to rule); 14.1.1–2. See also the lament for the Republic in *DRP* 5.2, more poignant because it is meant to be spoken almost a century before Cicero's own day.

122 Compare Cic. *Att.* 14.7.6, written in May of 44: even at this date, it was hard to criticize Caesar.

to have meaning after the Ides, and could be a useful heuristic tool in future works; Cicero did not know that he too would soon be dead.

As Andreas Alföldi pointed out, Caesar's association with Quirinus also fits in to the later Augustan identification with Romulus: if Romulus was the son of Mars, Augustus was the son of the *divus Iulius*.[123] This equation presupposes the absence of Remus, which we will see in the next chapter was unusual in the Augustan age. No one wanted to be equated with the twin who did not found the city; the emphasis in this association lies on founder and refoundation. In fact, the parallel is stronger than Alföldi suggests. Romulus is the son of Mars and also becomes Quirinus. Caesar is Quirinus, too, and thus Romulus himself; this makes Augustus both the grandson and son of Mars, and makes him both descended from and parallel to the popular Caesar. Much as Caesar drew a line between himself and Romulus, Augustus drew parallels between himself and Romulus *and* himself and Caesar. He thus reaped a triple benefit as divine founder, military leader, and new civic hero. This connection may not say much about Caesar's own use of Quirinus, but it does show how Augustus turned this use to his own advantage. A similar genealogical obfuscation is also apparent in Augustan imagery, as Tonio Hölscher has noted.[124] This association challenges the Ciceronian attribution of evil to Romulus as a universal sentiment. For Caesar and his supporters, Romulus continued to provide a favorable model. The earlier significance of the foundation as the product of a fair competition among equals continued to function, even in the late Republic.

Conclusion

Religious evidence reveals a variety of views about Romulus. Two festivals, the Lupercalia and the Parilia, are associated with the foundation. Both festivals were also manipulated by Caesar, indicating that they could be connected to contemporary concerns about kingship and collegiality. Of these, the Parilia's significance is more subtle. As a primarily rural festival, it was perhaps an inappropriate locus for elite competition.

The importance of the Lupercalia, on the other hand, is clearer. Ancient narratives of this festival indicate that the Lupercalia was a ritual re-enactment

123 Alföldi 1971:36–8.

124 Hölscher 1993 (most explicitly on p. 83), arguing that the Augustan use of Venus and Mars made Aeneas and Romulus seem like brothers; this in turn limited the *gentes'* claims to descent from either, and reinforced the significance of both founding figures as symbols of Augustus' own virtues. For similar purposeful confusion in Ovid, see Green 2004a:244.

of the productive competition seen in narratives of dyadic rivalry. My discussion of these two rituals has also shown how the twins' story was reinterpreted throughout the late Republic. Caesar's addition to the *luperci* in the Lupercalia of 44 is perhaps the most obvious example of the innovative use of the founders in this era, and offered a way for him to assert his supremacy in public view.

Caesar's association with Quirinus was another innovative use of the founder. In the 40s, as earlier in the Republic, deification was a more appropriate model for a political leader than kingship. A bid for divine status, whether before or after death, is echoed in the appointment of Antony as Caesar's *flamen*.[125] This type of priest also had authority in cults of Mars and Quirinus, both gods who would come to be important to the cult of Caesar. While I would not argue that later worship of Caesar followed his wishes, it does offer information about how Caesar's divinity was received and understood by later generations—including major sources for Romulus such as Livy. Finally, Caesar's association with Quirinus may help account for the unsympathetic depiction of Romulus-Quirinus in Cicero's later work. This association would be echoed, though in a favorable light, by Caesar's adopted son, Augustus, in his political imagery.

125 See e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 2.110.

CHAPTER 5

Art

Art offers a glimpse at a different world than that which the written narratives of early Rome provide. Although the producers (or rather, the patrons) of both types of work may fall into the same class, the educated elite, the audience of the two is not the same. Written histories and antiquarian works were produced for the consumption of the educated; monuments, provided that they were public, were to be viewed by all. The narrative changes required by dyadic rivalry are rarely depicted through visual language.[1] This absence suggests that the visual narratives had a different purpose than written accounts.

To avoid confusion between dyadic rivals and other types of doubles, I confine myself to depictions of known stories, which in practice limits my investigation to Romulus and Remus.[2] Most artistic material depicting the twins comes from the Augustan era, and is more complimentary than the literary narratives. In this chapter, I examine mainly public imagery, commissioned by the same elite who read the histories of the city. As a result, there can be no question of ignorance of this narrative trope; however, Roman monuments are aimed at a different and wider audience. They stress the miraculous salvation of the twins, rather than their later adventures.

The pictorial language of the Republic was more interested in the promotion of the city and its elite members than problematizing their competition. The differentiation between artistic versions produced for an external audience and the written narratives for an internal audience is similar to the distinction made in Propertius between the inhabitants' knowledge of the Parilia and the archaizing gloss shown to visitors. Similarly, Augustan imagery, with its focus on the virtues of the founder, avoided less positive depictions. I suggest that this omission may be due to the expected foreign—if not necessarily to Rome, certainly to the political elite—audience of these monuments. But the emphasis on the she-wolf and twins implies that Romulus and Remus, in

1 See e.g. Zanker 2002:116–19. For a semantic perspective on art historical interpretation, see e.g. Hölscher 2004b; particularly germane to the topic at hand are pp. 77–97.

2 Augustus used doubles liberally, particularly in the depiction of his successors. But his primary model was the Dioskouroi (see e.g. La Rocca 1994:79; Sihvola 1989:88). As I explained above (pp. 15–16), the Dioskouroi are not dyadic rivals; I will examine Augustus' use of these twins as part of the changed atmosphere of the Principate at the end of this chapter.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_007

these depictions at least, remained interchangeable; the equality that I argued existed in the literary material seems to be present here as well.

Republican Depictions

The exiguous remains of Republican art provide only limited space for analysis. It seems from what survives from this period that the primary image of the founders was the she-wolf nursing the twins. One of the earliest (and arguably the most famous) depictions of Romulus and Remus is the third-century she-wolf sculpture that was supposedly dedicated by the Ogulnii. This statue has probably been lost, but its dedication in 296 BCE is described by Livy.[3] As one of the earliest examples of public monuments in Rome, this statue has received a great deal of scholarly attention.[4] Wiseman makes it an important piece of his argument for the consolidation of the twins' story in the fourth century BCE. Because the Ogulnii were plebeian aediles, their dedication of the statue to both twins as founders—with emphasis on the plural—offers strong support for Wiseman's argument that the twins are related to the patrician-plebeian divide and reconciliation. It also supports my argument for the continuing balance of the twins during the Republic.

Several copies of the wolf statue were known in ancient Rome.[5] They were located in various central positions around the city, such as the Comitium and Capitoline Hill. These locations would encourage a viewer to connect the activities of the location (such as political speech or public sacrifice) with the imagery of the wolf and twins. It was thus important to keep this message positive and powerful, not only for Romans of all social rank, but also for foreign visitors to the city.

One copy was long identified with the she-wolf in the Capitoline Museum. This wolf has the characteristic spiky fur and canine muzzle that appears on numismatic depictions of the suckling twins. Unlike those depictions, however, the Capitoline wolf does not face backwards to the babies suckling her teats. Although her head does turn sideways to face the viewer, the statue is mostly frontal. Art historians have long known that the twins suckling the *lupa Romana* were Renaissance additions; recent investigation of the bronze alloys used in the sculpture have raised the question of whether the wolf, too, is a

---

3 Livy 10.23.11–12.

4 See e.g. Evans 1992:79–81, with further bibliography; Wiseman 1995a:72–4; Oakley 2005 *ad loc.*

5 See e.g. DH 1.79.10; Livy 10.23.11–12; Pliny *NH* 15.77; Evans 1991.

Renaissance work.[6] As no consensus on this issue has been reached, I leave the matter open. If genuine, the statue's significance is similar to that of the numismatic evidence, which it resembles and to which I now turn.

As the founders, the twins appear on some of the earliest coinage in the city. Although later iconography includes Romulus' regal *res gestae*, Republican coinage shows the twins as infants together with the she-wolf.[7] This depiction, possibly the most iconic image of ancient Rome, thus symbolizes the city. The twins together emphasize abundance or fertility, while the wolf reminds the viewer of their miraculous salvation. For anyone who did not know the city's history (certainly a possibility for circulating coinage), the twins offer a clear representation of Rome's self-definition. The fierce wolf tending to the founders advertised Roman ferocity and strength, but also their vaunted paternal attitude towards the conquered. The nurturing of the twins in particular may have offered a reminder of Rome's famed abundance of manpower.[8] Crawford suggested that the wolf "is perhaps the most obvious way of symbolising a belief in the imperial claims of Rome,"[9] and this interpretation seems quite likely.

This imagery disappears briefly in the Republic and is replaced by images that are more meaningful to individual families;[10] it is taken up again under Augustus, with a similar emphasis on fertility, abundance, and salvation. In the earlier period, however, the presence of both twins may also be intended to remind Romans of the collaborative origins of the city. Cicero (via Scipio) provides a similar reminder at the beginning of the historical portion of the *de Re Publica*.[11] This interpretation fits well not only with Wiseman's stress on the twins as symbols of patricians and plebeians, but also with a number of recent works on the importance of Italian identity.[12] For Augustan-era coinage certainly, but also potentially on the coins of the Republic, the twins were a

---

6 See Carruba 2006, an extensive re-examination of the statue; unjustly dismissed by Carandini 2011:37–8.

7 *RRC* #20/1 [269–66 BCE], 39/3 [217–15], 183/1–6 [169–58], 235/1 [137], 287/1 [115–14], and 388/1 [77]; see also Dulière 1979:43–6 (#M4 and M6–12; these are identical to the *RRC* coins listed, except for M10, which is not included in *RRC*]). Other images of the wolf and twins during the Republic include Dulière 1979 #G9 and G10, gems from the second and first centuries BCE.

8 The classic works are Brunt 1971 and Gabba 1976; see also Rich 1983.

9 *RRC* p. 268; the type is combined with a helmeted Roma, which adds an important element to the interpretation.

10 *RRC* pp. 712–14.

11 Cic. *DRP* 2.2.

12 E.g., Dench 2005; Farney 2007; Pogorzelski 2009.

marker of unity against other cultures. This makes the significance of Social War coinage showing the Italian bull goring the Roman wolf more pointed;[13] by turning supposedly inclusive iconography against itself, the Italian leaders make their dissatisfaction with Rome known.

In the Republic, the wolf and twins provide the only image of Romulus and Remus, either together or separately, that we find.[14] Several coins with a hooded male on the obverse were brought forward as evidence by Alföldi; he notes that these may be Hercules with the lionskin, but could also be Romulus with a wolfskin.[15] But Romulus does not usually wear a wolfskin.[16] Even in the case of Hercules' lionskin, the garment is a marker of conquest rather than adoption, as in the case of Romulus. Thus Alföldi's identification seems unlikely. Classen seriously challenged the idea that these coins depicted Romulus, a criticism that was accepted by Weinstock.[17] More seriously, none of these identifications was accepted by Michael Crawford in his standard work on Republican coinage.[18] Unfortunately, then, numismatics must be discarded as a further source of evidence.

The pediment of the temple of Quirinus also perhaps included the twins.[19] A relief from the late first century CE shows the monument as it appeared at that time. But as the temple was renovated by Augustus, the relief reflects its imperial appearance. The pediment design may have been different during the Republic. My analysis below examines both possibilities.

The surviving image shows the twins' augury contest, with each in his own augural tent. This matches what we hear from Cicero, and the identification of this scene is probable. Romulus is accompanied by Mars, Jupiter, and

---

13 E.g., *RRC* 553/420; 553/427.

14 Already noted by Weinstock 1971:176: "Romulus was not represented on coins, if we except the type with the she-wolf and the twins, before the age of Hadrian."

15 See Alföldi 1971:14–30. Some of the coins are not given further identification: 3.2, a Sullan-era denarius minted by Volteius (possibly *RRC* 385/2, identified as Hercules?), and 3.4 and 5, minted by Faustus Sulla in 55 (*RRC* #426/4a, identified as Hercules and dated to 56; Crawford criticizes the identification as Romulus on p. 449n2). The others were published elsewhere: 2.5–7, *BMC* 1.437 numbers 3543–5 and 1.1–3, *BMC* 1.481 numbers 3868–70. The latter belong to a series minted by Q. Cassius between 65 and 49; Alföldi suggests a date of c. 57. The identification of the first Cassius coin (1.1/*BMC* 3868) as Romulus is also criticized by Crawford (*RRC* #428/3, with n. 2), who identifies the figure as the *genius populi Romani* and dates the issue to 55.

16 For a potential exception, see below, p. 149–150.

17 Classen 1962:185; Weinstock 1971:176n8.

18 The *RRC* index (vol. 2, p. 867) does not even list them as possible images of Romulus.

19 See Palmer 1976; Haselberger 2007:140 and 154 for the Augustan-era renovation.

Victory, while Remus has beside him Mercury, Bona Dea, and Hercules. The significance of the various gods is difficult to interpret. The presence of Victory beside Romulus is an obvious allusion to his coming victory in the contest, as the literary versions of the augury contest make clear. Mars and Jupiter may indicate that we have here a reference to the 'archaic triad', thus explaining the relevance of this scene to the temple of Quirinus in particular.[20] If so, we have further evidence for the identification of Romulus and Quirinus, although the rest of the pediment is too late to help date the association. Yet it may also elaborate on the purpose of the augury contest; it is not only to see who will found the city, but also which will be the *unus* who will be allowed to join the ranks of the gods.

We know the story of Romulus; the significance of the gods with Remus is more difficult to interpret. Hercules is a demigod and usually seen favorably by Roman authors. The Bona Dea's cult is known to us more from the profanation of its rites by Clodius than from myth.[21] But Propertius links the two, and it is possible that Remus had a link with the Bona Dea and Hercules, much as Romulus had a link with Mars and Jupiter.[22] Wiseman has argued that the twins' story developed from the myth of the Lares. If this is correct, the appearance of Mercury on the pediment is also comprehensible.[23] The presence of Mercury here may also be due to his role as psychopomp, with the implication that Remus' loss in the contest will ensure his death. The two interpretations are quite similar, as Mercury was *en route* to the underworld in the Lares myth.

Because the pediment is preserved only on a late first-century relief and may display the Augustan rather than Republican temple, a chronologically-sensitive reading is difficult. It is possible that Romulus is marked as the winner here, as in the literary sources. But the fact that both twins have an equal number of powerful gods on their side may also be understood as a sign of their equality and collegiality. In this case, the pediment reinforces the equality of the twins seen throughout the Republic. Although Romulus and Remus are depicted in an agonistic context, their competition is fair because both twins have powerful gods to help them. The seemingly more balanced depiction of

---

20 The use of this term is slightly problematic, but there is still some support for the existence of such gods. See e.g. Dumézil 1996: the fact that these three gods were tended to by the three *flamines maiores* does seem to link them closely.

21 On the rituals, see Brouwer 1989; on Clodius' intrusion, see e.g. Tatum 1999:62–86, with bibliography.

22 See Propertius 4.9; the connection to the Quirinal pediment is not part of the lively debate on this poem, although Wiseman 1995a:70–71 associates the Bona Dea with Rhea Silvia.

23 Wiseman 1995a:65–71, drawing on Wiseman 1993.

the founders in Republican monuments and coins is consistent with the argument I have made for their equality in second-century authors.

This is also in keeping with Augustan-era depictions of the twins. As we will see, when Romulus and Remus appear together, it is always as equals; the moment of their conflict is not memorialized. But that does not preclude the savvy viewer from seeing signs that Romulus will ultimately win. As we will see in the Esquiline tomb frescoes, Romulus and Remus can be depicted as temporary equals.

Augustan-Era Depictions

More material survives from the Augustan period, but there are few depictions of the twins. Two monuments in particular, the frieze of the Basilica Aemilia (figure 1) and the wall paintings of a tomb found on the Esquiline near the columbarium of the Statilii, depict scenes of early Rome (figures 2–3). Both the frieze and the frescoes come from a known archaeological context; additionally, the scenes are part of a larger pictorial program on early Rome, so there is little question of their immediate relevance. This status as parts of a larger whole bars us from examining the images of Romulus and Remus in isolation. Instead, they must be viewed in the context of the entire monument.

In the case of the Basilica Aemilia, this is extremely difficult. Although the history of the monument as a whole is fairly well known, the phase of building to which its friezes belong is still hotly debated.[24] It is also not clear how

24 Coarelli 1985:206–207 suggests 78, while Simon 1966 thinks it belongs to the late Neronian period (after the fire of 64 CE). The date that has found the widest acceptance among modern scholarship has been the restoration(s) of 55–34: see Furuhagen 1961, Dulière 1979, Bauer 1988, Hölscher 1988, and Albertson 1990, as well as *LIMC* s.v. 'Romulus et Remus', no. 16 (J. P. Small). This mid-century dating is itself problematic, as the sources are unclear about whether these are two separate phases of construction (cf. e.g. Cic. *Att.* 4.16.4, App. *BC* 2.26 vs. Dio 49.42). It has been challenged recently, moreover, by a group of scholars who date the frieze to the Augustan age. Originally proposed by Strong 1976, the Augustan dating has been championed by Kampen 1991, Lipps 2007, and Ertel and Freyberger 2007. The last present an extremely strong case for a date in the middle or late Augustan period based on both stylistic and technical criteria, in particular the relief technique (pp. 122–9). Lipps 2011, the most recent study of the marbles, reaffirms a late Augustan (potentially even early Tiberian) date for the entire monument. The difference in marble between the figured frieze and the other decorative elements (Luna vs. Pentelic) nonetheless make judgment difficult.

closely, if at all, the pictorial program adhered to the original sculpture of the second century BCE. It is likely that the similarities were minimal, perhaps limited to the overall subject matter. The most recent evidence suggests that the frieze itself is late Augustan. This date helps explain the largely positive spin put on all of the depictions; as I argue in the next chapter, Augustus was eager to rehabilitate Romulus from his negative associations.

Only a fraction of the original friezes remain, and of these, many are extremely small fragments that cannot be securely identified.[25] Because even the larger slabs that survive were no longer attached to the walls that originally bore them, there is no immediate context for any of the scenes, even those that seem fairly easy to understand. The order in which they should be interpreted is therefore far from clear. The fact that the content of the friezes is both largely unknown and among the few remaining examples of art depicting early Rome only adds to the problems of analysis. It is possible, but by no means assured, that the Statilii frescoes offer assistance.[26] As is well-known, private works often borrowed larger-scale public iconography; the most famous examples are the many reappearances of the Romulus and Aeneas iconography, believed to be modeled after the statues in the Forum Augustum, found throughout the western provinces. But the appearance of the dog-headed Aeneas in Pompeii should likewise make us wary of seeing pure copying in private adaptations of public monuments.[27] The Statilii frescoes may have had a similar iconographic plan to the Basilica Aemilia, but the correspondence does not seem to have been one-to-one, and should not guide a reading of the frieze.

Of the Basilica's preserved panels, only a few allow for identification. These scenes depict the exposure of the twins;[28] the building of a wall; two men fighting; a woman within a pile of shields; and several women paired with men. The identification of these last two scenes as the death of Tarpeia and the rape of the Sabine women has been uncontroversially accepted, and as a result of these identifications, the frieze is in general considered to have shown scenes of early Roman history.[29] Less universally accepted is the possibility that these

25 Between one-eighth and one-ninth of the original frieze remains, approximately 22 out of an original 184 meters; see Furuhagen 1961, Simon 1966, Brilliant 1984:29–30, Bauer 1988, Albertson 1990, and Kampen 1991:449–52 for different attempts at reconstructing the monument; Arya 2000:315 for a summary.

26 Holliday 2005 is too sanguine about the iconographic similarities between these two very different monuments.

27 See especially Zanker 1990:265–96; Shaya 2013.

28 However, this fragment is quite small; see Kränzle 1991:19.

29 Furuhagen 1961; Simon 1966, followed by Albertson 1990, sees only scenes from the life of Romulus, but this has not been universally accepted (see *contra* e.g. Hölscher 1988:357;

scenes were originally part of a visual calendar that paired scenes from history with the festival that derived from them (in other words, a more static vision of a festival beside its aetiological cause).[30] In this case, the wall-building scene would have illustrated the Parilia, while the two men fighting would perhaps be the Regifugium.[31] But these identifications of the scene are not assured by any means; other possibilities for the wall scene include the foundation of Lavinium or Alba Longa,[32] rather than the building of Rome, while the scene of two men fighting has also been identified as the duel of Aeneas and Turnus, of Romulus and Acron the king of Caenina, and of a Horatius and a Curiatius.[33]

The identification of Acron has been generally accepted by modern scholarship.[34] Seeing Acron here offers strong support for an Augustan date, since the *spolia* seem to have become a more prominent topic under Augustus.[35] The rise of the Principate marked the end of the grant of *spolia*, because Augustus always had the auspices; Livy comments on this in his explanation of the original trophy, and Romulus *tropaiophoros* become an Augustan motif. The theme was so important that Augustus even chose it for the statue of Romulus in his Forum.

If we accept, however, that the Basilica friezes were in effect a pictorial calendar, this identification cannot stand. Although Fred Albertson identified the warriors as Romulus and Acron, he did not indicate to what festival they would be connected; Acron is not a major figure in surviving historical accounts of early Rome, and Jupiter Feretrius is not connected to a well-known holiday.[36] It

---

Kränzle 1991:19, at least four fragments of the Basilica relate to Aeneas; Evans 1992; Cappelli 1993; Arya 2000:312; Ertel and Freyberger 2007).

30 Argued by Albertson 1990 on the basis of the friezes' iconographic content; contrast Brilliant's description of the frieze as "salient episodes bounded by weak connectives" (1984:29).

31 On the Parilia, see above, pp. 103–113; for the identification of these scenes, see most recently Albertson 1990:806–9.

32 See e.g. Cappelli 1993:58–9 (based on similarities with the fresco from the Statilii tomb, on which see below, pp. 127–131); Furuhagen 1961:146 takes no position.

33 Horatii and Curiatii by Carettoni 1961; Aeneas and Turnus by Furuhagen 1961; Romulus and Acron by Simon 1966. Kränzle 1991:34–5, although he has some hesitations, suggests Manlius Torquatus and a Gaul.

34 The story is found in Livy 1.10; Prop. 4.10.5–16; and DH 2.33–4.

35 See Harrison 1989; Flower 2000; Geiger 2008:130; Kearsley 2009:150 for the debate over Crassus. Oakley 1985 argues for the importance of duels in the Republic; if there were few such combats, the glory of the *spolia* would be decreased.

36 For the temple of Jupiter Feretrius used in Roman political speech, see e.g. Vasaly 1993:44–59 (on Cicero's first *Catilinarian*); even here, there is no indication that the god is related to an important festival, although he is a savior of the city.

is thus difficult to argue that the frieze depicts this duel. Similarly, Aeneas and Turnus have no association with a festival, and thus their presence could not explain the calendric function of the frieze.

But the presence of Romulus and Acron is problematic even if the Basilica Aemilia friezes do not form a pictorial calendar. The clear presence of another duel taking place to the right of 'Romulus' makes the identification dubious; a paratactic series of men, similar in style to the François tomb, suggests either a battle (in which case there is little reason to assume that Romulus was involved) or, among the current suggestions, the battle of the Horatii and Curiatii. But even this is just a hypothesis; the pictorial program may be allusive and symbolic rather than strictly narrative. Christine Ertel and Klaus Freyberger have noted that most scenes on the frieze can be fit into two symbolic categories: scenes of combat, which highlight Roman virtue, and religious scenes, which emphasize Roman piety.[37] Thus no specific identification of the actors in the scene is necessary; as an *exemplum* of Roman military *virtus*, it more effectively alludes to multiple battles at the same time.

If the Basilica as a whole depicts scenes from early Roman history, it seems to avoid the most controversial of those scenes. This is true even when negative episodes, such as the death of Remus or even the attempt to determine the founder of the city through augury, are both immensely important to Roman history and figure prominently in contemporary literary accounts of the city's foundation. The apparent absence of any unfavorable scenes in the surviving remains of the Basilica Aemilia friezes may be due simply to its nature as a public monument. As Rosanna Cappelli has argued, the friezes are an instrument of self-promotion for an elite Roman family; it is hardly self-promotion to advertise the city's worst moments.[38] For the very fragmentary Basilia Aemilia, survival remains another real possibility. Yet while neither of these things is true for the Esquiline frescoes, a similar reluctance to engage with negative imagery can be seen there, too.

The small columbarium, near that which belonged to the important family of the Statilii (and possibly related to it), is located near the Porta Maggiore on the Esquiline, and began to be used in the third century BCE. Although some of the tomb's later decoration has been lost, the fresco with scenes of early Rome dates to the late first century BCE.[39] It was decorated at some point during the Augustan transition, and displays several similarities to the literature of this

37 Ertel and Freyberger 2007:127.

38 Cappelli 1993.

39 See Andreae 1966:461; Nash 1981:359. Photographs of the third-century paintings exist; the surviving frescoes are currently in the Museo Nazionale alle Terme.

period. T. Statilius Taurus was a comrade of Augustus', and Cappelli argues that their relationship lay behind the choice of imagery in the tomb.[40] As was the case with the decoration of the Basilica Aemilia, the tomb's walls depict scenes of early Rome. These frescoes, although pockmarked for long stretches and in some places entirely gone, are nonetheless substantially better preserved than the friezes of the Basilica. The scenes depicted here range from the earliest beginnings of Rome, under Aeneas, to at least the adulthood of the twins Romulus and Remus.

The western wall, which depicts the twins, is in fact one of the most difficult to interpret. The scene of the twins' exposure (figure 2), in the middle of the surviving images, is quite clear, and easily identified from the reclining river-god to the left, as well as the two men carrying a basket on the right. The scene is marked off from the previous and following episodes by the presence of a pillar and a rocky outcrop respectively. This is typical of the demarcation of scenes in the tomb as a whole. It is the scene immediately following that causes difficulties in interpretation. This depiction (figure 3), to the left of the exposure scene, shows a man in a flat-brimmed hat with some flocks, probably goats; he wears a short tunic and a cloak that covers one arm and in his other arm he holds a stick. This man is clearly a herder of some sort. A short distance away is another man, who is much more poorly preserved. He is usually interpreted as identical to the first figure, but this is unlikely from the surviving image. The second man's clothing is different; the hem of his tunic touches his knees and falls in a v-shape between them. On his head, rather than a broad-brimmed hat, the second man seems to wear a helmet, with a crest that extends at a slight angle. His gaze, too, seems to be pointed downwards. He stands in the center of the picture; to the right, right up against the column that separates this scene from that of the twins' exposure, is a rocky outcrop with a veiled woman seated atop it. Animals surround her, too, and she has one hand raised in the air.

The scene is usually attributed to the youth of Romulus and Remus: during the period when they were under the care of Faustulus, they cared for

---

40 Cappelli 1998:58. For a useful account of the columbarium, its finds, and its inhabitants, see Caldelli and Ricci 1999; they, however, identify the Statilius Tarus of the tomb as the son of Augustus' friend, although still living within the Augustan period (pp. 46–60). The relationship is contested by Holliday 2005, citing Baldassarre et al. 2002; while I agree that the important members of the Statilian *gens* were unlikely to have had a hand in the design of this tomb, I do not think it unlikely that those buried in it were part of the larger *familia*, and may have been influenced in their choice of iconography by their masters' (or general Roman) tastes or opinions.

the royal flocks as he did, and were the most respected of the neighborhood youths.[41] This scene then seems to show a rare depiction of the twins as young men, rather than the usual representation of them as infants suckling the she-wolf. If so, the she-wolf scene would be entirely absent from this series of depictions—an unusual, even astounding, omission. Cappelli has argued instead that this scene depicts the discovery of the infant twins at the Lupercal, a scene that is otherwise missing from the depictions in the tomb. In this case, the two men, whom she still interprets as shepherds, are not the twins but Faustulus and Faustinus, his brother. The rocks imply the setting of the Lupercal, while the woman is possibly Acca Larentia or a local deity.[42]

This interpretation of the scene is ultimately unsatisfying. Faustinus is a rare addition to the discovery of the twins, found in Dionysius alone.[43] Even in Dionysius he is a minor character, and may simply have been a way for Dionysius to include two names that he had heard for the twins' foster-father. The fact that the character is obscure is not enough to disqualify the suggestion; the twins are found by two men in several later depictions.[44] But in those cases, the men are shown next to each other and dressed identically. This is not the case on the Statilii fresco. Instead, the two men here are facing each other, and wearing substantially different clothing; more importantly, the central figure is slightly larger than the one to the left. The size difference is admittedly not great, but it is present. Given this difference, and the fact that both men's faces are inclined down and to the left, it seems likely that both are looking at something in the now-lost part of the fresco. Cappelli may be right to identify this as the discovery of the twins at the Lupercal; in that case, the familiar depiction of the twins lies just out of our sight.

But the scene may also be something else entirely, and it is worth considering what other episodes from the twins' life may have furnished material.[45]

---

41 As in, e.g., Furuhagen 1961:151. For the literary accounts of this period of the twins' youth, see e.g. Livy 1.5–6; Ov. *F.* 2.359–80.

42 Cappelli 1998:56; but note the caution in her suggestion that "incerta rimane l'identità della figura femminile." Holliday 2005, while disagreeing with Cappelli, suggests that the Lupercal scene is nonetheless present in this panel.

43 DH 1.84.3.

44 E.g., the house of Fabius Secundus in Pompeii (V.4.13), and on an altar found in Ostia (Ara dei Gemelli; II.7.3). On the reuse of monuments from the Augustan Forum in provincial public and private contexts, see e.g. Shaya 2013.

45 Andreae 1966:463 is at a loss as regards this scene; he thinks it "als eine idyllische Szene oder auf das Leben, das Romulus und Remus bei den Hirten führten, gedeutet wird." But surely a generic scene, as in the first option, is unlikely, given that the other scenes in the fresco depict specific events in the early history of Rome. The fact that the foundation of

Possibly the scene depicts Romulus' discovery that he will become a god; the veiled figure at the far right, with her hand raised, may be prophesying. The scene may also fall outside of the Romulus saga: unlike the arguments that have been made for the Basilica Aemilia, it is generally accepted that these frescoes show the legends of Rome from Aeneas on to (at least) Romulus. If the fresco showed not the discovery, but the youth of the twins, the absence of the she-wolf scene is indeed striking. This columbarium belonged to freedmen and slaves; it is tempting to see this absence as a rejection of Rome's self-promotion, as discussed above.[46] Roman authors often attributed dismay at Rome's wolfish character to foreigners and conquered nations.[47] The ferocity of the wolf, rather than its gentle nature, was also the theme of Horace's poem, written from a lower-status persona. But as the damage to the fresco is very great in this panel, further interpretation is difficult.

Another explanation for this absence may be found in the public art that the columbarium's artists may have used as a model. The twins appear only rarely on Augustus' public monuments. Possibly the best-known example of this is the scene of Romulus and Remus on the west side of the Ara Pacis (constructed 13–9 BCE).[48] As one of the two scenes depicting Roman origins that form a pendant at the monument's entrance, this would seem to be the ideal location to seek an Augustan representation of early Rome. The sculpture has, however, almost entirely disappeared (the twins themselves are completely gone), and as a result it is difficult to say anything about the nature of this depiction.[49] The suggested characters include Romulus and Remus, the she-wolf, Faustulus,

---

the city itself is not shown indicates to Andreae that a further scene must be added to what survives; this makes it even more difficult to interpret the depiction in question.

46 As the she-wolf appears on other funerary monuments of freedmen, status alone cannot guarantee this interpretation.

47 See e.g. Justin/Trogus 38.6.7–8, with Adler 2011:15–58.

48 For Aeneas and Romulus in Augustan art, see e.g. Hölscher 1988 and Zanker 1988.

49 See Dulière 1979 (#7); La Rocca 1983:43; Settis 1988:412. Kampen 1991:454 argues that Livia's presence on the altar, in combination with other imperial women and the paradigm of Aeneas and Romulus as founders of the city, "testif[ies] to the … concern with regulation of female sexuality," similar to the program that she sees in the Basilica Aemilia; Hölscher 2000:261 suggests that the twins symbolize military virtue (in contrast with Aeneas' *exemplum* of piety), which seems like an excessive weight of interpretation to place on such a fragmentary relief.

and Mars;[50] there are traces of a bird, perhaps the *picus*.[51] Certainty is difficult, however, as the panel itself is so fragmentary. The twins here, if present and not chosen solely for their role in Rome's origins, were probably chosen as a symbol of prosperity, peace, and abundance, and of course as symbols of the city itself.[52] This message echoes Republican coinage and Augustus' self-promotion as the restorer of the Republic.

There are other examples of such imagery on Augustan monuments. For example, the victory monument at Actium includes a more reliable Augustan image of the twins and the she-wolf.[53] Here, they are made of terracotta rather than marble and seem to have functioned as drain-spouts; several fragments have been found.[54] The iconography is roughly similar to that on Republican and later coinage, accounting for the difference in medium. The Actian images and numismatic iconography offer a guide to the potential appearance of the Ara Pacis.

In contrast to his use of twins to indicate abundance, Augustus unsurprisingly did not choose to depict scenes that might indicate tension between equals. Although it was not completed until after the majority of works under consideration here, the Forum Augustum could be considered the culmination of Augustus' ideological program.[55] The Forum was centered around a

50 Castriota 1995:155–7 argues that Faustulus cannot be depicted here, because the figure is too regal. Instead, the standing figures are probably Numitor and Mars, and depict the twins' ancestors; Numitor "would have functioned as a counterpart to the analogous togate figure of his royal ancestor Aeneas in the opposite panel, a vital link in the Alban lineage uniting the Trojan colonists and Rome's founder." This suggestion has not found general acceptance, and it does not seem to me possible to judge the depictions, given the exiguous remains

51 La Rocca 1983:43.

52 Compare the eastern wall, which features a woman with twins on her lap. Her identity is disputed, but she seems to be a symbolic rather than narrative figure: e.g., Simon 1967:27–8 suggests it is Italia; La Rocca 1983:43–9, following what Simon considers the traditional identification, interprets the figure as Tellus; Zanker 1988:175 thinks it is Pax and the *aurae*. Ertel and Freyberger 2007:125–6 identify the figure as Tellus, but compare it stylistically with the figure of Roma on the Basilica Aemilia. Regardless of how one identifies the figure, her role as a bearer of prosperity seems clear; possibly no single figure was intended.

53 See Zachos 2001; he dates the monument to c. 29 (p. 39). See also Lange 2009:111–17 on the Roman nature of this monument.

54 See Zachos 2001:38–9.

55 For the importance of not over-estimating the impact of the Forum (dedicated in 2 BCE) on Augustan poets, see Rebeggiani 2013. On the Forum as a whole, see e.g. Zanker 1968,

quadriga-statue of Augustus, which stood in front of the temple of Mars Ultor; this announced his successful defeat of the tyrannicides and *pietas* in avenging Caesar's death. Flanking either side of the Forum were galleries filled with statues of famous Romans. One side held ancestors of the Julii, including Aeneas and the kings of Alba Longa, while the other featured famous Republican heroes and Romulus. The arrangement stressed not only the primacy of Augustus, but also civic harmony; men who had fought against each other were given similar statues, and may even have been placed side by side. This glossing over of strife, even from the recent past (such as Sulla and Marius), emphasized that Augustus had brought peace. Moreover, the connection of the Republican *summi viri* with the Alban kings reminded contemporaries of Caesar and his claim to descent from this dynasty.[56] Augustus may not have copied Caesar's self-identification, but he also did not abandon the connection between his family, the twins, and early Rome. Moreover, Romulus was both the descendant of the Alban kings and the founder of major institutions, such as the Senate. If the arrangement of the Forum Augustum has been correctly reconstructed, Romulus—like Augustus himself—offers a link between Alba and the Julii on the one hand and the Republic on the other.

The depiction of Romulus from the Forum Augustum seems to have been as a lone king.[57] Remus is not mentioned and probably was not depicted in the gallery of great men that lined the sides of the Forum; he was perhaps better forgotten.[58] This is especially true if, as Joseph Geiger has argued, the Forum served a primarily didactic purpose, not only teaching the plebs about the great men of their past, but also advertising the end of internecine conflict.[59]

Spannagel 1999, and Geiger 2008 (all more archaeologically-based); for a discussion of the relevant sources, see e.g. Putnam 1985, Garani 2007, and Ingleheart 2007.

56 See works above, p. 100n47.

57 Cf. CIL VI.8.3 40937, *Ro*[*mulus rex*] | *M*[*artis filius*] | *ur*[*bem Romam condidit*] | [*regnavit ann*(*os*) XXXVIII] ("king Romulus, the son of Mars, founded the city of Rome and ruled for 38 years"). Degrassi's suggestion, that this was in fact a dedication *to* Romulus, does not seem to have been followed (*I.Ital.* 13.3). On the inscription, see Spannagel 1999:281–2 and Geiger 2008:130.

58 This seems true in spite of Zanker's emphasis on the inclusivity of the Forum's pictorial program (see Zanker 1968:18–9). Muth 2012:14–21 reminds us that Republican imagery was largely absent from Rome's public spaces in this period; Augustus' choices of inclusion and exclusion thus become doubly significant.

59 Geiger 2008:78–99; 128; 156. See also Zanker 1990:206. That Romulus is a symbolic representation of Roman values is not Geiger's own idea; see e.g. Hölscher 1988:357 (Romulus and Aeneas represent Rome) and Zanker 1988 and 2002:79–80 (Romulus and Aeneas represent *virtus*).

The inclusion of another character in the story, one with a competing claim to Romulus' throne, would confuse this message, particularly as the rivalry of Romulus and Remus did *not* end in peace according to most contemporary versions of the tale.

Remus is similarly absent, although Romulus may be present, in the pedimental sculpture of the temple of Mars Ultor. As preserved on the Claudian-era Ara Pietatis, the pediment shows a seated figure holding an augural staff beside Venus and a personification of the Palatine.[60] Given the strongly Julian bent of the Forum, the augural figure seems more likely to be Romulus than another king; one cannot rule out, however, the possibility that the figure does not depict a specific augur. Rather, he may refer to the foundation and good fortune of Rome itself.

Although the absence of Remus in the program of the Forum Augustus seems obvious, it is nonetheless significant; again, Augustus elsewhere used the imagery of both twins and the she-wolf. His choice to avoid such imagery in his Forum emphasizes the possibility of misinterpreting this symbol in the context of the city's foundation. This is especially true if we recall that Augustus famously built the Forum Augustum on his own land, rather than appropriating space from the civic elite.[61] This apparent nod to equality could also be understood in a hostile manner, as Augustus depriving the elite of their right to compete with him in his building projects. By omitting Remus, viewers in the Forum were not encouraged to reflect on the shared power among the earlier elite. In that regard, it is significant that all of the statues seem to have been individuals, rather than in groups or pairs.

The choice of Romulus as a victorious king was also natural, given Augustus' known self-identification with the founder.[62] The iconography of the Forum was not simply based on important figures of Rome, but also on the contribution of Augustus and his ancestors to the city. Given the ideological charge of Actium, which pitted Augustus against his brother (in-law) Antony, it is not surprising that the ultimate identification of Augustus and Romulus did not take place. Augustan imagery of Romulus and Remus focuses on the twins' salvation, for three main reasons: first, it emphasized the miraculous associations and divine ancestry of Rome's founders; second, the image was immediately

60 See e.g. Galinsky 1996:208–9, with bibliography.

61 *RGDA* 21.

62 Suet. *Aug.* 7.2. The name issue is discussed further by (e.g.) von Ungern-Sternberg 2006:63–9. For Romulus and the Forum, see e.g. Spannagel 1999:193; *contra*, e.g., Syme 1939:313 and Herbert-Brown 1994:61–2, both arguing that the negative implications of Romulus' name precluded Augustus from making extensive use of him.

recognizable and iconic; and finally, it was least likely to recall the end of their relationship. The death of Remus was not to be celebrated, but avoided. This avoidance did not need to be heavy-handed; instead, it was a conscious decision to emphasize a different part of Romulus' life story, one that was more in line with Augustus' own political program of just leadership and civic harmony.

Castor and Pollux

Although Augustus did not often refer back to Romulus and Remus in his use of iconography, he did not abandon doubled characters altogether. Such figures, when properly deployed, could promote the positive message of fertility and abundance that was central to Augustan iconography, rather than the founders' reminder of civil war. To this end, the *princeps* chose to highlight the Greek twins Castor and Pollux. These twins, with their famous devotion to each other, provided a better example of familial harmony than Romulus and Remus did. Their fraternal *pietas* reinforced the importance of succession in Augustus' new political system, as well as the recovery of the Republic from internecine strife.

The importance of the Dioskouroi at Rome began quite early: their temple in the Forum has its earliest phase in the fifth century BCE.[63] This matches the legendary account of the cult's foundation, which allegedly took place after the battle of Lake Regillus, when the Roman army defeated a much larger Etruscan foe.[64] The twin sons of Zeus at that point appeared in Rome itself to announce the city's victory; according to some accounts, they appeared in the

---

63 Holloway 1994:8 rejected this dating on the grounds that it is based only on the fill. The full report of the Danish excavators in fact bases the dating not only on fill, but also on the foundations of the podium (Nielsen 1992, who freely admits (p. 107) that subsequent renovations of the temple reused matertial, so that little remains of the Republican phases; see also, in summary form, Nielsen's article in the *LTUR* s.v. *Castor, aedes, templum* [= Nielsen 1993]). All that remains of the first temple are scanty fragments of tufa walls in *opus quadratum*, which, while early, may be later than the early fifth century. It is in any case unusual that the first temple "stood apparently unaltered for approximately three centuries," while the subsequent temples underwent visible renovations approximately once every fifty years (Nielsen 1993:243–4); however, the Augustan temple did not undergo significant renovations, either. New evidence in the form of the apparently untouched archaic architectural terracottas (Fischer-Hansen 2008:282–3) strongly supports the traditional dating and conservative appearance of this temple.

64 The Lavinian inscription *Castorei Podlouqueique quorois* has generally been taken as proof that Castor and Pollux came to Latium directly from Greece, without an Etruscan

sky during the very battle to indicate that the victory belonged to the Romans.[65] This assuredly fictional tale, recognized even by ancient authors as a calque on the south Italian battle of the Sagra, provided the temple with its foundation legend.[66] With such a long history at Rome, Castor and Pollux were almost as important to the city as Romulus and Remus.

By the middle Republic, the role of the Dioskouroi in Rome was both clear and consistent: the twins were symbols of Roman victory, and in particular of equestrian victory and pride. The twins appeared numerous times on the reverses of Romain coinage, both public and private issues;[67] they were celebrated, along with the *equites*, in the *transvectio equitum*;[68] and finally, by at least the Late Republic, their temple was used for political purposes, as a meeting-place for the senate and as a speakers' platform at contional assemblies.[69] Clodius was among the greatest innovators in this regard: Cicero refers to him barricading the temple against senators.[70] Recent excavations

---

intermediary; as such, the role of Castor and Pollux in Etruria will not be given any further consideration here. See also Cancellieri 1994:63.

65 See Livy 2.20.12 and 2.42.5, DH 6.13; Pairault-Massa 1992:156 suggests that on the mid-fourth century Ficorini Cista, the twins "serve a ricordare sia gli *hospitia* romano-prenestini sia l'alleanza tra Roma e Praeneste alla battaglia del lago Regillo."

66 Guzzo 1994:27; cf. Just. 20.2–3 (an abbreviated account is given by DS 8.32 and Str. 6.1.10). In fact, the stories are not that similar; the Locrians at Sagra sought help from the Dioskouroi before the battle and made several vows to them in the event of victory, whereas the twins appeared at Regillus of their own accord (DH 6.13) or, in Livy (2.19–20), not at all. As Cicero (*ND* 2.6, 3.11–3) mentions the similarity of the stories, it is not Dionysius' invention. Sihvola 1989:85n147 suggests that this parallel was part of a political program intended to connect Rome with Magna Graecia through the Dioskouroi.

67 See *RRC* #304/1 (109/8 BCE), 307/1a–d (108/7 BCE), 312/1 (106 BCE, but possibly the Penates), 259/1 (129 BCE, but only one twin), 335/4, and 335/10a–b (96 BCE); Välimaa 1989; Petrocchi 1994. Poulsen 1992a:49–51 suggests that many of these coins have been misidentified as Castor and Pollux, however, and should rather be seen as simply Janus-heads; only the two figures on horseback should be considered the Dioskouroi. This would still leave the twins on 13 out of 292 public and private issues from the years 211–120.

68 On the *transvectio equitum*, see Livy 9.46.15 and DH 6.13; on the special relationship between the Dioskouroi and the *equites*, see e.g. Sihvola 1989 and Pairault-Massa 1992:207 ("i Dioscuri diventano il simbolo dell'ascesa sociale e politica di una clase in un processo interno alla società … e, nello stesso tempo, dell'espansione dello stato romano").

69 See Poulsen 1992b:56 on the archaeological remains of the tribunal; ancient sources on the explicitly political uses of the temple include Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.129, *Har. resp.* 28, *Domo* 54, 110, *Sest.* 34, 79, 85; Plut. *Sulla* 8.3; *CIL* I^2 586.1; for a full listing, see Nielsen 1993:242. For a longer discussion of the political uses of the temple, see Morstein-Marx 2004, esp. 50–8; Budesheim 2006; Sumi 2009; Champlin 2011 on the Principate.

70 E.g., Cic. *Pis.* 11.

have hinted at a possible reason behind the popularity of this temple as a locus of political activity. In addition to its location across from the *curia*, offering a non-elite audience a chance to make their voices heard in the senate, the basement of the temple was filled with shops. These were not particularly nice stores, according to the excavators; their uneven size and depth would make them "bazaar-like" and "at variance with the solemn functions of the temple."[71] The amphorae found here bear traces of wine, oil, and perfumes, indicating that a trip to the temple could function both as a political and economic activity. The shops may even have made political distributions easier. The twins offered varied gifts.

This important social and political role did not end with the end of the Republic. Augustus used the Dioskouroi as an ideal model of familial harmony and shared rule. His choice of Castor and Pollux in particular was significant, and linked back to the ideas seen in the Forum Augustum. In the various copies that survive of the statue group of Aeneas, Iulus is depicted wearing a Phrygian cap, one of the iconographic identifiers of the Dioskouroi in Greek and Etruscan art. These twins, then, are visually connected to the founder of the Julian *gens*. They offer a familial model for behavior that is more appropriate for the stability of Augustus' day than Romulus and Remus.

The association of the Julio-Claudians with Castor and Pollux extended to multiple sets of Augustan heirs. Gaius and Lucius, when Augustus chose them as his heirs, were ideologically patterned on the Dioskouroi.[72] Tiberius and Drusus would also be associated with these twins. Even Augustus himself, as Stefano Rebeggiani has recently argued, consciously chose Castor and Pollux as models for his own iconography.[73] Although Gaius and Lucius remain the most obvious choices for identification between the imperial household and the Dioskouroi, the identification was more deeply rooted.

The choice of two successors, as well as the decision to represent them as twins, is significant. While Gaius and Lucius were perhaps best represented as

71 Nilson, Persson, and Zahle 2008:58.

72 La Rocca 1994:79, "*Gaio e Lucio Cesari.* Sono i primi per i quali è testimoniata in modo aperto ed evidente l'analogia con i Dioscuri"; many of the other contributions in the same volume also stress the equation of the Dioskouroi with Gaius and Lucius in particular. See also Sihvola 1989:88, "nell'epoca augustea il culto di Dioscuri sembra assumere un aspetto del tutto nuovo: si comincia ad identificare gli eredi del potere con i divini gemelli"; Poulsen 1992a:51, "in light of the importance of Castor and Pollux as symbols of a victorious Rome, it was natural that Augustus should have come to use the two heroes in his promotion of certain members of the Imperial family as part of his succession policy" (similarly, Poulsen 1994:94–6).

73 Rebeggiani 2013.

twins (even though they were not), this was not true for all of Augustus' successors. They varied greatly in terms of their respective ages and relations to each other: Tiberius and Drusus the elder, Drusus the younger and Germanicus, and even the (biological) twin infants of Drusus the younger and Livilla.[74] There is no reason why they could not have been depicted separately as glorious men of early Roman history, or even together as valiant consuls. It is true that, as Birte Poulsen notes, "l'uso di Castore e Polluce nella propaganda degli eredi del princeps già avveva un precedente nel caso di Gaio e Lucio." Yet that precedent did not need to be followed. Tiberius and Drusus, the next set of heirs, were much older than either Gaius and Lucius or the eternal youths Castor and Pollux. Similarly, the heirs did not always get along. Augustus clearly had the opportunity to change the official iconography—and chose not to.[75] Instead, he made a conscious decision to depict his successors as the Dioskouroi, even those who had left the youth of Castor and Pollux behind them. This reliance on the Greek twins in particular is due to the myth of Castor and Pollux, which lacks the underlying power struggle seen in Roman legends and focuses instead on strong affective ties. The Greek legend elides any lack of harmony that existed within the imperial household, providing an idealized model for the imperial family. Augustus tried to make his household into an example for other Romans; one of the more famous examples of this is the banishment of Julia. A struggle for power among family members was not an acceptable paradigm for imperial behavior.

Conclusion

As was the case with the religious evidence examined earlier, artistic evidence offers a different perspective on the twins' relationship in the late Republic and early Augustan period. But some of the same trends of dyadic rivalry that appear in literary evidence are visible in this material as well. The twins seem to have remained, for the most part, interchangeable during the Republic. This

---

74 See LaRocca 1994 for a detailed description of how these relationships were constructed, both in literature and the monuments of the city. The connection between other members of the imperial household (Tiberius and Drusus; the younger Drusus and Germanicus; the twins of Germanicus) and the twins was earlier outlined in Scott 1930a and b.

75 Poulsen 1994:95. See Sumi 2009 and Champlin 2011 for further explorations of the significance here; Hadszits 1931:108 argued that the restoration of the temple prefigured a change in nomenclature to stress the plurality of the brothers (i.e., *aedes Castoris* to *Castorum*). This change would also indicate a strong fraternal relationship.

suggests a certain amount of equality between them. As founders of the city, they could be used to represent the Romans, and particularly the upper classes.

Artistic and numismatic evidence, however, show little evidence of the essential features of dyadic rivalry as it appears in literature. In particular, it lacks the narrative arc that leads to the downfall of one of the rivals. This absence is unsurprising, as visual material has long been known to have different concerns than literary material. The didactic message of appropriate behavior in an agonistic context was perhaps less suited to a visual medium. The significance of Romulus and Remus, then, was slightly different in material than textual culture.

This apparently negative result nonetheless indicates the continuing importance of the twins in multiple media, as well as the choices made by the artists or commissioners of these works to emphasize only their positive aspects. There are two likely (and possibly complementary) reasons for this. The first is that these monuments were meant for public consumption, and extended beyond the elite. There was less need to problematize the interaction of the city's leaders before other members of society; in fact, it was more productive to reaffirm elite cooperation and equality, as we see in the surviving material record. This suggestion contradicts Hölscher's argument that art of the late Republic was primarily intended for the Roman elite;[76] monuments were commissioned by them, but seen by everyone in the city.[77]

The second reason is that the unfavorable aspects of dyadic rivalry were simply too negative to depict on public monuments. The patrons of this material were certainly trying to convey a specific message about the city's origins to an audience that would include not only lower-status Romans, but also foreign visitors to the capitol. Knowing that this work would meet such an audience, I suggest, would encourage its commissioners to present a unified and positive face, downplaying the suggestion of internal rivalry or dissent.

Both of these suggestions about the imagery of the Republic find support in scholarship on Augustuan visual material. As Hölscher suggests, monuments were aimed at a broad audience in the Augustan era. At that time, the twins' story conflicted with Augustus' self-presentation as a bringer of peace; Romulus and Remus were closely tied to the preceding century of civil wars.[78] Augustus wanted to distance himself from this association.

---

76 Hölscher 1994, esp. pp. 142–3, contrasts Augustan art and middle Republican art, both of which were broader in scope.

77 See Hölscher 2004a.

78 See chapter three.

Romulus and Remus may also have reminded Romans that the end of the civil wars had, in fact, been achieved through the death of a brother: Augustus' brother-in-law, Mark Antony. Since Augustus had gone to great lengths to distinguish and separate himself from his former colleague, he would not have wanted to bring up memories of their old relationship. It is in this light that the use of Castor and Pollux becomes more meaningful. These Greek twins, devoted to one another even through death, offered a hopeful and didactic message for Augustus' new Rome. Unlike dyadic rivals, who fought until there was a clear winner and then began again, Castor and Pollux cooperated. This pacific vision of the imperial family in particular helped solidify Augustus' claims to have restored a better society than the one he had found upon taking power.

In Augustan art, mythological characters like Aeneas and Romulus shed their symbolic weight; in Paul Zanker's words, they are "intellectualized and idealized paradigms."[79] By shrouding these characters in their own, and thus his, exemplary morality, Augustus dissociated them from the myths of which they were a part, and thus from the competitive nature of their relationship. Under Augustus, the scene of suckling twins would become "a symbol of selflessness and love within the family"[80]—hardly the terms that Horace would have used to describe the founding brothers, but very similar to Castor and Pollux. The long-term presence of a single head of state was accompanied by a significant change in Roman myth. The emphasis on productive competition found in dyadic rivalry disappears; instead, the story emphasizes peace and the supremacy of the survivor.

---

79 Zanker 1988:207.
80 Zanker 1988:278.

CHAPTER 6

Walls

The battle of Actium in 31 BCE would have far-reaching effects on Rome, even if these effects were not realized immediately. The suicide of Cleopatra soon after the battle marked the end of an era, for she was the last of the Hellenistic rulers; that of Antony similarly signaled an end to the preceding decades of civil war, although this would have been less immediately apparent to contemporaries. Actium, together with the earlier defeat of Sextus Pompey at Naulochus, left Octavian in possession of great power. This power would not ultimately be shared among equals, although it was in fact shared—at least to a degree. His trusted companions, like Agrippa and Maecenas, lacked his insistent, personal connection with Julius Caesar; quick punishments, like that meted out to Gallus in Egypt, offered a vivid lesson that it was safer to be second-best. Through the 20s, Octavian carved out a new position for himself in the Roman political arena: the Principate.[1] Ultimately, this position detracted from the significance of elite competition in the public sphere. With one higher authority established, the risks and rewards of officeholding were lower; those of attempting favor were correspondingly higher. Regardless of an individual's view of the *princeps*, this change in government gradually but irrevocably changed the nature of elite dialogue.[2] The Augustan age is thus marked as a period of transition.

In 27 BCE, Octavian took on the honorary name of Augustus. According to later sources, he had flirted with the idea of using 'Romulus' instead.[3] This choice was ultimately rejected, supposedly because he did not want to be seen as a king. The tradition may be apocryphal; as we have seen, the name 'Romulus' was not unsuitable for leaders in this period. It had been connected to the salvation of the city and its beautification, a project that Dio and Suetonius knew

1 See e.g. *CAH*² vol. 10, chapters 3 [Crook] and 9 [Talbert]; Talbert 1984.

2 There is, of course, a vast bibliography on this topic. In addition to the several companions to Augustus (Blackwell, 2003; Cambridge, 2005; Edinburgh, 2009), works dealing more explicitly with the transition include Raaflaub and Toher (eds.) 1990; Gurval 1995; Galinsky 1996; for impact on the eastern empire, Spawforth 2012; for the Augustan age as a period of transition, the papers collected in Farrell and Nelis (eds.) 2013. All have wide-ranging bibliographies. The *locus classicus* for this change, though, is Tac. *Ann.* 1.2.

3 See e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 7.2; Dio 53.16.7. The association between Augustus and Romulus was long ago laid out by Kenneth Scott (1925); see more recently Starr 2009 for echoes of Romulus in the *Res Gestae.*

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_008

Augustus was proud of.[4] But by the 20s, the name had unpleasant associations with civil war.

Nonetheless, Augustus promoted the founder as a victorious king and model for his own role as *princeps* through his use of imagery. This primarily positive depiction also separated the founder from his twin. By setting Remus in the background, Augustus tried to downplay the suggestion of rivalry or tension between the two. When Remus appeared, it was as part of the strongly Republican imagery of the she-wolf and twins, reasserting the *princeps'* claim to have restored the state. Augustus' own use of the founder was thus carefully selected and selective: he capitalized on the gains which could be made from his association with Romulus, while trying to minimize its potential problems.

The literature of the Augustan era teems with references to Romulus. Because these references build on and respond to the assertions of the 40s and 30s, a brief reminder of the changes seen in those decades may be helpful. In earlier chapters, I argued that the negative depiction of Romulus that we see in authors such as Horace was primarily a response to the political strife of the triumvirate. The founder's depiction earlier had been more ambivalent; his image later was again less directly negative, but also more cautious. Surviving Augustan material does not indicate that Romulus' name was used with negative weight in this period—nor was it even paired with an insulting adjective, as in Sallust's comment about Sulla. Instead, surviving authors show similarities to Augustus' own usage, although not necessarily with the same tone.

Under Augustus, Romulus is primarily a figure to be emulated, a status that grows stronger throughout Augustus' reign. The *princeps* himself does not problematize the twins' relationship as a form of dyadic rivalry; instead, he emphasizes the survivor's positive qualities. Remus is a less important figure than his brother; among contemporary authors, Ovid gives him the largest role, and it is only to clear Romulus of blame. This refusal to problematize the twins is an eloquent silence, and may reflect upon the relatively limited opportunities available to the elite at this time, compared with the Republic. As a new political culture emerged with Augustus, the significance and semantics of Roman mythic history underwent a shift as well. Ultimately, this change would end the use of the twins as a tool to think with; in later regimes, it is the founders of the Republic, not the city, whose tales are retold.

Augustan evidence offers a last hurrah for Romulus and his relationships. The founder twice attempts to share power, with both Remus and Titus Tatius. These stories are best known from Dionysius and Livy, who offer the fullest surviving account of the foundation, but also appear in the works of the

---

4 See *RGDA* 19–21 and 24 for beautification; 1–6 for salvation.

Augustan poets Vergil, Propertius, and Ovid. All of these writers relate the relationship of Romulus with Remus, and especially Remus' death, with a different nuance, indicating the continuing vitality and importance of this myth in the Augustan age.

Dionysius and Livy

As discussed in previous chapters, the differences in context and content between Livy and Dionysius are substantial. The similarities of their accounts are also considerable enough to merit examining them together. Such overlap is unsurprising: both were historians, and thus shared a similar generic view; both also aimed at didacticism in their histories. The extent of overlap of their reading is uncertain, but extant; the later annalists should be considered a common source. Since they worked from an at least partially shared tradition, the differences we see in their narratives are likely to be a result of their authorial choices, rather than ignorance.

The stated aims of Livy's and Dionysius' work are quite different. Livy's preface offers moral lessons for a fallen generation.[5] Dionysius, in contrast, aimed to explain Roman greatness by tracing their descent back to the Greeks.[6] These are two starkly opposed outlooks on the state of contemporary Rome. Livy's narrative of decline seems to have illustrated Rome's greatness up to the third Punic War; Dionysius' history suggests continuing success.[7] We would reasonably expect, then, to see in both Livy and Dionysius an account of the founder that was more favorable to the Romans. Yet it is only in Dionysius that we do.

Complicating this picture is Livy's reference to the distant past as a respite from the troubles of his own age at *praefatio* 5. This makes his proposed alternative versions of the past—which are indeed usually more pessimistic than Dionyius'—more difficult to account for. If the past is a respite, it ought to be more pleasant than the present time; instead, Livy's account of the city's origins is fairly dark.

Livy shows limited faith in the veracity of Rome's early history.[8] He is aware that narratives of this period in particular can be altered to suit an author's

5 See esp. Livy *praef.* 5–11, with Walsh 1955.

6 DH 1.2.1–5.1; for commentary, see e.g. Delcourt 2005:43–60, with bibliography; Peirano 2010 problematizes this question.

7 In addition to the varied works on Livy and Dionysius in this section, see e.g. Ridley 2010 and 2013 (the former with a judicious bibliography); Gabba 2000.

8 See, e.g., Livy 2.21.4; 6.1.1–2; 8.40.4–5.

needs. His transmission of multiple narratives, then, is not only a way to advertise his erudition; it is also a way for him to offer a more era-appropriate story of early Rome. This is particularly true in the politically charged tale of the death of Remus, which in Livy's day at least would have conjured up a host of civil war memories: the paternal relationship of Caesar and Pompey, Sextus Pompey's long resistance and eventual death, and (most unforgettable in Augustan Rome) the death of Antony in a war over Roman sovereignty. Carsen Lange has recently stressed the continuing significance of the triumviral period throughout the Augustan era.[9] Livy is a contributor to this process. Although Lange does not examine the foundation in any detail, his conclusions about the importance of the 30s even in Augustus' own self-presentation fit with my interpretation of Remus' death as a sensitive topic throughout the late first century BCE.

Although the variance between Livy and Dionysius can be attributed to their different narrative goals and socio-political contexts, the similarities are less easily explained. As is obvious from the overlap in their accounts, there were several possible ways to present the Romulus myth. Both choose to present their readers with options, but their choices differ. The historians share a version of Remus' death in which Romulus is not to blame, a sharp departure from the condemnations of Horace and Cicero in the late 40s and early 30s. But this exculpatory tale is far from anodyne. The story of Remus' death in the mêlée is similar to the rivalry we see in the Ennian account; however, by this period such rivalry has become destructive. Instead of benefitting the city, it plunges all involved into discord. Elite tension has now grown out of control.

The brawl is presented differently by Livy and Dionysius. Livy dismisses the affair in a single sentence: *inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem vertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit*.[10] The use of *certamen* reminds us that we are still in an agonistic context. There is no blame here; Remus' attacker is left purposefully vague. So is the instigator of the fight. Through use of cautious plurals, Livy avoids expressing an opinion. He does not fault either of the twins or their partisans. The reader can then choose his preferred interpretation: the narrative makes it possible to fault Romulus,

9 Lange 2009. Although I find Lange's stress on the presence of the triumviral aspect throughout Augustan imagery excessive, I agree with his broader point that Augustus could not hide the internecine nature of the civil war from his contemporaries. That Antony was his brother-in-law as well as his political partner strengthens the parallel with Romulus and Remus for the post-Actian writers.

10 Livy 1.7.2, "Then, once they had fought with both angry words and weapons, they turned to murder; Remus was struck in the crowd and died."

Remus, or to refrain from blame. This caution may be perfunctory, as Livy does not prefer this version; Dionysius, on the other hand, considers it more likely than the alternative.

The Greek historian's version is not much longer, but it strongly marks the tension between ambition and collegiality. He describes a clear progression from the ambitious competition of the twins at first and their later discord and rivalry: τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῖς δόξαν παρέσχε φιλοτιμίας, ἵνα θᾶττον ἀνύηται τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἁμίλλῃ τὰ ἔργα, αἴτιον δὲ τοῦ μεγίστου κακοῦ, στάσεως, ἐγένετο.[11] As with Livy's account, Dionysius is careful to note the agonistic atmosphere. He clearly lays out a framework for productive rivalry: two teams competing for the benefit of Rome. Although the contest was aimed at doing good, the twins' rivalry quickly went sour. It soon became an evil that led to Remus' death. Dionysius here elucidates the pattern of dyadic rivalry in its positive light: the twins are engaged in φιλοτιμία, the productive rivalry that had the potential to benefit the state. This is similar to the version given by Ennius in his account of the foundation. In Dionysius, though, this rivalry does not ultimately reach a positive conclusion. Instead, it is destructive, both to the twins' relationship (Remus dies) and to the state (because of *stasis*).

Dionysius is careful to dissociate the twins from any hint of infighting; the failure of their φιλοτιμία is not their fault. In his account, Romulus and Remus do not take up arms against each other, as do (for example) Eteocles and Polyneices at Thebes. Because Dionysius wishes to show the essential Greekness of the Romans, we might expect to see parallelism with this similar Theban story. But there are in fact few similarities, indicating that Dionysius is relying here on Roman stories and Roman concerns. In his account, the brothers are bickering and their respective supporters start fighting without receiving orders.[12] If the twins are to be charged with failure, it is their inability to control their followers, rather than their murderous instincts or quick tempers, which are to blame.

Similarly, Dionysius distances Romulus from involvement in his brother's murder. He says simply, ἀποθανόντος δ' ἐν τῇ μάχῃ Ῥώμου.[13] Remus' death is thus almost accidental. Like Livy's anonymizing participle, Dionysius uses a passive verb to describe Remus' fate. This detaches and depersonalizes the death; no one is at fault here. In fact, Dionysius takes Livy's neutral description a step

11 DH 1.85.4, "This offered them a field for competition, so that they could complete the work more quickly by striving with one another, but actually became the cause of the greatest evil, *stasis*"; compare 1.87.1, where the rivalry comes to blows.

12 DH 1.87.1.

13 DH 1.87.3, "Rhomos [=Remus] died in the battle."

further by simply stating that Remus 'died' (ἀποθανόντος) rather than 'was struck' (*ictus*). This choice of vocabulary leaves open the possibility that no single individual was responsible for Remus' death; he may have been killed by a party, trampled, or struck by the gods.

Dionysius also claims that not only Remus, but also the twins' foster-father Faustulus, died in the struggle.[14] Ver Eecke traced this version back to Licinius Macer and interpreted it as a memory of civil war, identified with familial conflict.[15] It is, of course, likely that the death of Remus could be associated with civil strife at any point after a civil war. But the impersonal story of the brawl seems less likely to memorialize the civil strife that we hear about in the late Republic. Ancient authors write histories of great men; in the accounts we have, leaders drive the civil strife, not their unnamed masses. Macer is usually considered a pro-plebeian historian and may have wanted to show the agency of the people; if so, it is unlikely that he would have done so by making them responsible for civil war.

But while I find it unlikely that the death of Faustulus symbolizes familial conflict, it is probable that his death raised memories of the innocent victims of civil strife, such as men killed in the proscriptions, through association with a prominent figure or simply through mistaken identity.[16] Thus it is more likely that these variants had accreted layers of memories by the late first century, none of which was most prominent; they worked together to instill a sense of loss and discord. This is reinforced by the fact Livy and Dionysius offer two versions of Remus' death, indicating that the topic remained sensitive during the Augustan regime.

Further support for this interpretation of the mêlée may be found in both Dionysius' and Livy's insistence that political rivalry was the primary cause for the brothers' quarrel.[17] The focus on conflict underscores the tension that I have argued is inherent in dyadic rivalry and that culminated in Augustus' sole rule. In my interpretation, then, civil war in and of itself might not necessarily lead to blaming Romulus for Remus' death; a version that strongly recalled civil strife could also exculpate the founder. The separation of memorialization and censure may have seemed to be a safe compromise when faced with a new Romulus. In this case, Dionysius' preference for the tale is not surprising. Not

14 DH 1.87.2.

15 ver Eecke 2008:217–20. On Macer, see *FRHist* 1.320–31; for contemporary brawling connected with the *devotio*, see e.g. Rosenblitt 2011:416.

16 The most famous case being Cinna the poet.

17 Livy 1.6.4, *regni cupido*; DH 1.85.6, ἐκ δὲ τῆς φιλονεικίας ταύτης ἀκοινώνητος εὐθὺς ὑπεδηλοῦτο φιλαρχία; contrast DS 8.6.1, who attributes Remus' demise to φθόνος.

only is this relatively favorable version more closely aligned with his stated aims, but it was also a better match for the *pax Augusta*.[18] Livy's skepticism, in contrast, is fitting for an Italian who remembered the vengeful Octavian.

A final and significant difference between the two historians is that in Dionysius' account, Romulus was upset over his brother's death, a theme that recurs in Ovid's *Fasti*. Although this may be dismissed as mere rhetorical coloring, its appearance in both Ovid and Dionysius—who may have read similar sources, but almost certainly not each other's works—suggests that this was a known variant. My earlier analysis indicates that this version is likely to be early, which is supported by its appearance in Dionysius and Ovid. As previously discussed, Dionysius names primarily Greek-language sources, indicating a strong reliance on early Roman historiography such as Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus (although he was also capable in Latin).[19] Ovid's presentation of Romulus, in contrast, is strongly influenced by Ennius. This more sympathetic depiction of Remus' death sets Dionysius and Ovid apart from other accounts, such as Livy's, in which Romulus' role is ambiguous or sinister, suggesting that Remus' death was welcomed by the founder.

The second version of Remus' death, in which he is killed after he jumps across the nascent city's wall, is quite different in Livy and Dionysius. This story is well-known and does not need to be recounted in detail. I discussed Livy's brief account, which condemns Romulus, in chapter three.[20] It harks back to the unfavorable depiction of Romulus in Horace and Cicero. In contrast, Dionysius' version, which is paralleled by Diodorus and, later, by Ovid, is relatively favorable. Although we have two surviving Greek accounts, they show few verbal parallels; the epitomized state of Diodorus' narrative may be at fault, although the surviving narrative is both coherent and self-contained.

---

18 This point is also argued by Delcourt 2005:245–8; at p. 258, she notes that Remus' death in Dionysius is purifying. For the connection in Greek thought between purification and foundation, see Dougherty 1993; for purification in Rome, see Lennon 2013.

19 It could be argued that Dionysius' position as a Greek outsider is a more important determinant of his authorial choices than his era. But this argument is ultimately wrongheaded. Dionysius' rhetorical works provide ample evidence of his connections among the Roman elite, and his use of Roman sources is also known (see above, p. 74n74). It seems fairly safe to say that he had a Roman readership of some size, consisting at least of his students and patrons; he may also have consulted them while writing. The internal evidence for audience is not extensive, and scholars have come to different conclusions: e.g., Schulze 1986 suggests a mixed audience, while Gabba 1991:79–80 suggests primarily a Greek audience (although his note 27 is more nuanced).

20 See above, pp. 75–6.

In these versions, agency is attributed to Celer, one of Romulus' workmen. Dionysius' account stresses Celer's agency by having him address Remus with a construction parallel to Remus' initial complaint:

> φασὶ δή τινες συγχωρήσαντ' αὐτὸν τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ἀχθόμενον δὲ καὶ δι' ὀργῆς ἔχοντα τὴν ἀπάτην, ἐπειδὴ κατεσκευάσθη τὸ τεῖχος φλαῦρον ἀποδεῖξαι τὸ ἔρυμα βουλόμενον, Ἀλλὰ τοῦτό γ', εἰπεῖν, οὐ χαλεπῶς ἄν τις ὑμῖν ὑπερβαίη πολέμιος, ὥσπερ ἐγώ· καὶ αὐτίκα ὑπεραλέσθαι· Κελέριον δέ τινα τῶν ἐπιβεβηκότων τοῦ τείχους, ὃς ἦν ἐπιστάτης τῶν ἔργων, Ἀλλὰ τοῦτόν γε τὸν πολέμιον οὐ χαλεπῶς ἄν τις ἡμῶν ἀμύναιτο, εἰπόντα, πλῆξαι τῷ σκαφείῳ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ αὐτίκα ἀποκτεῖναι.[21]

This perhaps indicates that Celer's action was not unjust, but the appropriate response to Remus' offense. As Dionysius offers no comment on this story, however, the expected reaction is difficult to judge.

The case is the same in Diodorus, writing in the mid-first century. His account of Romulus and Remus comes from the fragmentary book eight, and while these excerpts are likely to preserve Diodorus' text, the extent of abbreviation is unclear. This is the only version Diodorus offers that survives. As is to be expected, his narrative is short. Unlike Dionysius' account, though, Diodorus makes Remus complicit in his own death. Remus envies his twin and continually provokes Romulus. Romulus replies to the instigation with words; Remus retaliates with actions. It is Celer who finally reacts and kills Remus, not Romulus. Diodorus' account is a major support of Wiseman's argument for Remus as a 'slow' twin, although it does not add much to Dionysius' fuller narrative.

The two texts contain a number of linguistic similarities, but these are more likely to be due to similarity of content than because of Dionysius' reliance on Diodorus. The similarities are at solely the verbal, rather than the structural, level. Moreover, Dionysius' account is far more complimentary to Romulus, who is absent from the fatal scene. Diodorus, in contrast, acquits Romulus of murder, but depicts friction between the brothers. Yet the transmitted narratives are also similar: in both, the twins are clearly at odds with one another,

---

21 DH 1.87.4, "Some say that he (Remus) ceded command to Romulus, but he was angry at the deception. When the wall was built, desiring to show that it was of no account, he said, 'But any enemy could jump over this without difficulty, like me!' And immediately he leapt across. And one Celer, a man standing by the wall and who was the overseer of the works, said, 'But any one of us would without difficulty drive that enemy off!' As he spoke, he hit Remus on the head with a shovel. He was killed instantly."

while it is Celer who actually commits the murder. The possibility of a common source cannot be ruled out.

It is not entirely clear that Celer's agency should put Romulus in the clear. Several scholars have suggested that Celer is an 'anti-Romulus': in such a scenario, by putting the blame on Celer, ancient authors expected their audience to understand that Romulus was, in a way, still to blame.[22] This is made explicit in Diodorus' account, when Celer claims to be following the king's command.[23] But because Dionysius finds the mêlée version preferable, he seems to excuse Romulus.

In summary, there are two options presented by both Dionysius and Livy. In one of them, Romulus is definitely freed from the blame of his brother's death; in the other, the issue of culpability is trickier. Livy certainly claims that Romulus is at fault, but does not elaborate. Dionysius, on the other hand, seems to imply that Romulus is innocent, but again offers no real commentary.

We can only conclude that the question of Remus' death was an important and perhaps even sensitive issue in the founding years of the Augustan Principate. The refusal of both writers to choose a single version, which they could have done had they wished, may indicate a real uncertainty as to which offered a preferable model.[24] Since Augustus (Octavian at the time Livy was writing) identified himself closely with Romulus, the guilt of the founder in regard to his brother's death held political significance. Livy's preference is in many ways riskier than Dionysius'; he suggests that Romulus was at fault. This may be due to social context; Livy was writing at a time when Augustus' power had been determined only recently, if at all. In Dionysius' day, as in Ovid's, the *princeps'* authority and cultural dominance over the foundation narrative had been assured. Dionysius' account thus shows the influence of Augustus' own presentation of the foundation narrative, regardless of his own opinion of the *princeps*.[25]

Unwillingness to take sides in the issue of Remus' death, to censure Romulus or to absolve him, suggests a continuing discomfort with the story and its potential relevance to the current day. The options provided offer a slight corrective to the unfavorable accounts of Cicero and Horace—but in Livy's case,

22 See e.g. Meurant 2003b; *contra*, Delcourt 2005:261–2. This argument makes Celer a sort of 'double' for Remus.

23 DS 8.6.2; cf. Ov. *F.* 4.835–48 (discussed below, pp. 159–168).

24 Both Dionysius and Livy offer a preferred version, which is not quite the same; by the act of putting the alternative option into their text, they authorize it as a legitimate variant. There were alternatives (for example, Cato's famous refusal to name names in his history: Nepos *Cat.* 3.4).

25 For Dionysius and Augustus, see e.g. Gabba 1991:211–13; Delcourt 2005:363–9.

it is *very* slight indeed. As one might expect of the Dionysian project, the Greek author's account offers a more sympathetic retelling to the Romans.

In both Livy and Dionysius, rivalry itself is problematized, rather than the tension that produced it. This represents an innovation in the pattern of dyadic rivalry that, because it is common to both authors, may have been of particular salience in the late first century. The differences between Livy's account of the death of Remus and Dionysius' may be ascribed not only to their different narrative aims, but also to an evolving understanding of how to present this narrative in a new, post-Actian context.

Vergil

The *Aeneid* may seem a surprising choice for a chapter concerned with Romulus and Remus. The epic is notable more for its lack of Romulean imagery than the presence of Romulus. As the *Aeneid* takes place several centuries before Romulus is born, the virtual absence of Romulus is unsurprising. But as an epic that is often seen as encapsulating the values of the Augustan regime, the few times that the founder is mentioned are highly significant. Romulus in the *Aeneid* lacks the suggestion of menace seen in Livy and even to a certain degree in Dionysius; instead, the wholly positive image of the founder seems more similar to the depiction seen earlier in Cassius Hemina. The lack of conflict, even for ultimately beneficial ends, marks out Romulus as an idealized figure. Instead of using the twins as a model for discord, Vergil thrusts the city's strife upon Aeneas instead.

Romulus appears in the *Aeneid* seven times (including the occasions when he is called Quirinus).[26] On all of these occasions, he is depicted as either an infant or as a successful king. The turbulent part of his life, his youth and break with Remus, is completely omitted from this laudatory narrative. This aligns with both the mid-Republican use of the twins, visible on coinage, and the later use, by Augustus himself, of Romulus alone as founder. Vergil elides any potential reference to the death of Remus. When Jupiter narrates Romulus' biography in *Aeneid* I, he moves straight from birth to kingship:

> ... geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem.
> Inde lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine laetus

26 Verg. *Aen*. 1.276 and 292–3; 6.778, 809–11 (not by name), and 859; 8.342 and 638. The poem was unfinished at Vergil's death in 19 BCE.

> Romulus excipiet gentem, et Mavortia condet
> moenia, Romanosque suo de nomine dicet.[27]

Remus is not mentioned here, except in passing as Romulus' twin. This omission echoes the laudatory history of Cicero's *de Re Publica*, and is fitting for the city's new epic. The twins' birth, like the miracle of the suckling wolf, can be seen as an indication of the luck and fertility of Rome: Jupiter's prophecy of the city's future greatness has no place for civil war. This is further stressed by the description of Romulus as *laetus*. The context suggests that Romulus was not so much happy with his lupine nurse as favored because of it. In the *Aeneid*, the choice of Romulus as the auspicious founder of the city has been transferred from the augury contest to his very birth. With no mention of Remus, the potential for civic strife is eliminated. The 'twin birth' of line 275 could easily, in a primeval world, refer two cities.[28] We learn later that both twins were rescued by the she-wolf,[29] but here, Remus is nowhere to be found at the time of foundation. At some point in the interim, he silently disappears from the history of Rome.

The sole time Remus is mentioned in the poem comes slightly later in the same prophecy. After Augustus' victory at Actium, the world will be at peace; one of the markers of this is that *Remo cum fratre Quirinus / iura dabunt*.[30] The presence of both twins ruling together is reminiscent of the consuls, and also of Cassius Hemina's history. The pacific nature of the twins' relationship fits Augustus' new self-fashioning; although not necessarily inspired by Augustus, it helps explains the *princeps'* pleasure with Vergil's poem.[31] This is strengthened by Vergil's presentation of the foundation. Only fifteen lines earlier, Romulus had founded the city by himself, with no suggestion of rivalry over whose city it was supposed to be. In the brief presentation we see in the *Aeneid*, we could

27 Verg. *Aen.* 1.274–7, "Ilia will give birth to twins. Then Romulus, lucky because of the yellow protection of his nurse the wolf, will lead out his people and found the walls of his city, naming them 'Romans' from his own name." If line 275 relates to Romulus' headdress, it is one of the only indications we have that Romulus dressed in a wolfskin; see above, p. 121.

28 Compare the many 'Italic twins' in Vergil's later books (discussed above, p. 17).

29 See Verg. *Aen.* 8.630–4, where Aeneas' shield depicts both twins being licked by the she-wolf.

30 Verg. *Aen.* 1.292–3, "Quirinus with his brother Remus will make laws."

31 Note the stress on this in the *Res Gestae*: in particular, RGDA 6, *nullum magistratum contra morem maiorem delatum recepi* ("I took on no magistracy that was against ancestral custom"). Only the first instance of the three Augustus mentions could have been known to Vergil. See e.g. Grebe 2004 for the argument that Vergil connects Augustus to both Romulus and Aeneas as a mechanism of legitimation.

imagine that the twins chose Romulus as the eponymous leader without dissent, and that Remus was secondary until the government was established. This indication of a peaceful relationship between the twins offers a striking alternative to Horace's slightly earlier condemnation of their relationship as a curse upon the Romans. Under Augustus, the version that emphasized civil war was less relevant.

The major conflict between rivals in the *Aeneid* is, of course, not between Romulus and Remus for the city of Rome, but between Aeneas and Turnus for the hand of Lavinia. This war takes up the second half of the book, and offers several opportunities for doubling, if not for dyadic rivals. Recent articles by Tim Stover and Randall Pogorzelski have called Lausus and Turnus, respectively, Aeneas' 'doubles' and their deaths 'fratricide'.[32] I find the arguments of Stover and Pogorzelski convincing on the whole; it is quite likely that Aeneas had at least one double, given the freedom of this terminology. But he lacks a dyadic rival. At no point does Aeneas work together or cooperate with either Lausus or Turnus, a key condition for dyadic rivalry as described in the introduction.

Moreover, Turnus' fully fleshed-out character is different from the treatments given to unsuccessful dyadic rivals. He has multiple emotions and at times seems meant to draw the reader's sympathy. This is not the case with dyadic rivals. Lausus, on the other hand, is not greatly elaborated, a criterion that does fit dyadic rivalry. Still, he is not working for the same ends as Aeneas (he fights on the opposite side) and is unlikely to be a rival. The main characteristic of dyadic rivalry seen in Vergil's narrative is that there is only one winner: Aeneas.[33] This is a common feature of all rivalry tales, and is not enough to support the specific pattern that I have argued for.

The death of Turnus at the end of the *Aeneid* is a major critical issue, without question. The elimination of Turnus, if not necessarily his death, is crucial to Aeneas' success, a theme that has been argued exists in the foundation story.[34] They are undoubtedly rivals, pitted against one another for Lavinia's hand and power in the Italian peninsula. Their struggles may even recall civil war, an interpretation I have suggested applies to dyadic rivals in Vergil's era. But shared themes do not require identical narrative structures, and the

32 Pogorzelski 2009; Stover 2011. Turnus as Aeneas' double appeared already in Meurant 2000, although the argument there (for Girardian doubles) is different.

33 This was not always the case; the version offered by Cato (*FRHist* 5F6–9 = 1.9a-11 Chassignet = 1.9a-11 B-W = 9–11 P) is instructive.

34 See e.g. Nicoll 2001, esp. 197–99; for the twins, see works cited in chapter 1.

personality granted to Turnus by Vergil makes the antagonist of the *Aeneid* sympathetic and three-dimensional in a way Remus is not.

The same is not true of Lausus, whose role in the *Aeneid* is more subtle. He is not Aeneas' rival at all, but a proto-Aeneas, as Stover argues. Lausus' failed potential makes him more similar to Remus, but his tragedy occurs in a different way. Unlike Remus, Lausus is not allowed to reach maturity, and he dies in heroic *pietas*. Remus, in contrast, is an adult at death; *pietas* is not part of his story. The manner of his demise in our accounts ranges from foolish petulance to wasteful; it is never the beautiful death of a hero. Vergil's use and characterization of Turnus and Lausus present an alternative type of double to the dyadic rivals that we have seen. This variety of potential doubles is one aspect of the rich mythical tradition of Rome.

Vergil purposefully avoids the negative connotations of the Romulus and Remus relationship in order to avoid obvious reference to the previous years of civil war. His narrative is more nuanced. Instead, in terms of the founder, he turns his eyes firmly towards the future and Romulus alone.

Propertius

We have already encountered some of the Propertian narratives about the twins at the Parilia. But Propertius' account of Romulus and Remus is more wide-ranging than a single festival. With the exception of book 1, reference to a twin appears in all of his poetic books. This twin is usually Remus, and the emphasis on his death and the less flattering aspects of Romulus is a marked difference between Propertius and the other Augustan poets. Two poems in particular capitalize on the ambiguity of the founders: the quasi-recusatio poem 3.9 and the introduction to Rome at 4.1.[35]

Propertius' third book is, for the most part, still a work of erotic elegy. Towards the middle, two poems hint at the 'Roman elegies' that will follow: poems 9 and 11. Poem 9, addressed to Propertius' patron Maecenas, picks up on an earlier *recusatio* (in 2.1) of epic themes. In 3.9, Propertius mockingly recants his *recusatio*: he is willing to write epic at Maecenas' request, although he is not

35 The other poems featuring the founders are Prop. 2.1, to Maecenas, featuring a *recusatio* of epic themes that includes Remus (*regnave prima Remi*, line 23); 2.6, a brief mention of the rape of the Sabine women; 3.11, on Actium (on which see Gurval 1995:189–208, with earlier bibliography); 4.4, on Tarpeia, discussed above (pp. 107–111); 4.6, a poem on Actian Apollo; 4.10, a description of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the taking of the *spolia*. Book two is conventionally dated to c. 26 BCE; book 3, c. 23; book 4, c. 16.

suited to such poetry. Although this is a typical sentiment of elegy, Propertius reshapes the theme by framing the contrast between epic and elegy as a contrast between military and civic roles, rather than war and love. The praise for Maecenas' willingness to remain in the shadows (lines 21–32) when he has the capacity for military glory purposefully ignores Maecenas' civic talents, such as governance. The omission is made more pointed by the equation with Camillus in lines 31–2. Although Camillus' military glory brought him fame, his civic deeds brought him exile: this is a backhanded compliment.

When Propertius reaches his own potential contributions at the end of the poem, his topics are no less noteworthy. He suggests as epic themes the wars with both Titans (Coeus, line 47) and Giants (Eurymedon, line 48),[36] and finally reaches Rome: *ordiar et caeso moenia firma Remo, / eductosque pares silvestri ex ubere reges*.[37] This line is crucial to an understanding of Remus in Propertian poetics. We see first the notion that the twins are equals, a familiar theme by now: *pares … reges*. This again suggests that the separation of the twins is slightly artificial, and that both could be seen as founders of the city. Propertius' reference to their equal kingship suggests that he expects his audience to be familiar with their potential for equality, a theme that we have seen in earlier literature. Nevertheless, like other writers of the era, Propertius leaves the question of Remus' death unresolved. The anonymity of *caeso … Remo* allows a reader to supply any version of the story he chooses. As we saw above with Dionysius and Livy, at least three different narratives were current in this era.[38]

Lines 50–51 have often been interpreted as depicting Remus as a foundation sacrifice.[39] This view has been most forcefully advanced by Wiseman,

36 Richardson *ad loc.* suggests that this responds not only to Callimachus' rejection of Gigantomachy in the *Aetia*, but also to Horace's use of the theme; Stahl 1985:165 connects the *recusatio* to Perusia. On the positioning of narrator-subject and *princeps* in Propertian poetry, see Miller 2003:130–59 (on book 2, framed as epic vs. elegy) and 184–209 (on book 4); his broader conclusions apply to book three as well. See also p. 70–72 on Perusia. I owe this reference to Jessica Westerhold.

37 Prop. 3.9.50–51, "And I will lay out the walls proved by slain Remus and the equal kings led out from the sylvan breast."

38 See above, p. 142–146.

39 See e.g. Camps 1966, Fedeli 1985, Flach 2011, Heyworth and Morwood 2011, all *ad loc.*; Wiseman 1995a:117–125; Morgan 1998:186; Rea 2007:41–2. It is rejected by Richardson *ad loc.*, who prefers the idea of Remus' murder as a sacrilege requiring expiation; for this, see Cic. *ND* 3.94. Violence is typical of foundation narratives; see Cairns 1979:64–86 on Tib. 2.5 as a Greek-style foundation; Dougherty 1993 on Greek foundations in the archaic period; Maltby 2002b:6406 for the poetic relationship and interaction of Tibullus and Propertius.

who analyzed Remus' death as "a legendary analogue to the horrifying necessities of 296 BC" (referring to the possible human sacrifice under the temple of Victory).[40] But such an interpretation places too much weight on *firma* as 'strengthened', rather than the alternative 'proved'. In the 'vulgate' tradition of Remus' death, we see that Remus mocks the walls for being too weak to resist an enemy attack. He attempts to confirm this by attacking them, and is killed. This episode proves the protective aspect of the wall, and it is likely that Propertius here refers to the same tale, with *firma* indicating the probative function of Remus' leap. The walls, rather than being strengthened by Remus' death, are proven: they can indeed resist attack.

Propertius' implicit identification with Romulus in line 50 as the man who will lay out the city's walls (*ordiar ... moenia*) returns to the 'Romulus' we saw in Catullan usage. Rather than symbolizing a king or Augustus, Romulus here is any Roman citizen—even Propertius himself. When coupled with the death of Remus, Propertius' poem speaks obliquely of civil war. He chides Maecenas for encouraging epic when war at Rome has now turned upon itself. This sentiment echoes Propertius' other military poems, such as 1.21 and 1.22, and suggests that Propertius' opinion of strife had not improved over the intervening period.

Strengthening defenses against outsiders fits better with the surrounding lines on mythical battles, in which various monsters attack the Olympians and are defeated; Remus' attempted attack on the Palatine becomes the most elaborate of a series of attempts to disrupt the divine realms. But in Greek myth, Titans and Giants are also (distant) relations of the Olympian gods. All three conflicts can thus be viewed as civic strife, although the Greek examples are more usually reconfigured as external wars.[41] Remus' death hangs ambiguously in the middle: although on the one hand, he is Romulus' peer and thus a proto-Roman, he is also assimilated to Greek monsters whose defeat ensures the safety of the *polis*. This prefigures the idea of internal and external at Rome that we will see in 4.1.

As a reminder, this poem is an introduction to the city addressed to a visitor. After a catalogue of primitive vignettes (the gods' clay statues, the senate meeting on a grassy hill), Propertius comes to the founders: *quot gradibus domus*

40 Wiseman 1995a:125 with 208n116, citing also Florus 1.1.8. On human sacrifice at Rome, see Eckstein 1982; van Haeperen 2005; Várhelyi 2007. The topic of human sacrifice in the ancient world more generally has become a matter of great recent interest; see the collections of Bonnechere and Gagne 2013 and Nagy and Prescendi 2013 (both with a focus on Greece alongside other, non-classical ancient civilizations).

41 For example, at the Altar of Pergamon or on the Parthenon metopes.

ista Remi se sustulit! olim / unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus.[42] The *domus Remi* here is usually seen as a metrical substitute for *domus Romuli*;[43] if the line refers to the *casa Romuli*, this is a reasonable suggestion. But if one examines the couplet as a whole, the use of Remus is more revealing. The phrase *maxima regna* to describe the twins' home recalls the *maxima Roma* of line 1; in the regal period, the kingdom and city were the same. This fits with the *pares ... reges* of 3.9 and reinforces the idyllic equality of early Rome. Crucially, at the time of the twins' youth, Rome was big enough for both brothers. Propertius makes it very clear that his words refer to the past, not the present; Rome in his day lacks the space for multiple leaders.

The bucolic simplicity of this depiction of the early culture continues when Propertius reflects that *nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus: / sanguinis altricem non pudet esse lupam*.[44] There is a textual problem here, with *putet* being a possible replacement for *pudet*. It makes a difference in interpretation, as *pudet* is more likely to retroject this *alumnus* into the early era of the city. If so, we likely have a reference to the twins here: these actual nurselings had no family ties except for the *lupa*. This reading, to my mind, fits better with the references to Bovillae, Gabii, and the fate of Troy than the alternative, *putet*. This option changes the subject to a contemporary Roman who no longer reflects upon his past. The contemporary resonance need not be wholly lost; the violence of civil wars probably left many children without a parent. In such a circumstance, the identity of an adoptive parent was less important than the fact of adoption, much as we see in the case of the twins' salvation by the wolf.

A list of Roman *exempla* begins in line 45, with Remus reappearing in lines 49–50. This too has been interpreted as an indication of foundation sacrifice:

---

42 Prop. 4.1.9–10, "on what great steps did that house of Remus support itself! Once a single hearth was the greatest kingdom of the brothers." Murgia 2002:70 argues for a repunctuation and translates, "where that house is, Remus' house once stood"; this does not materially affect my argument.

43 E.g., Richardson *ad loc.*; *contra*, Gurval 1995:172, rightly, although his interpretation varies from mine.

44 Prop. 4.1.37–8, "The Roman nursling has nothing of his fathers' blood except a name; it does not shame him that his foster-mother was a wolf." This follows the text of Mueller; Richardson here prints *putet* without comment, in which case the second line should be translated, "he does not think about the fact that a she-wolf was the foster-mother of his race." Possibly we could see a parallel to Cicero's description of the fading Republic at *DRP* 5.1–2.

si modo Avernalis tremulae cortina Sibyllae / dixit Aventino rura pianda Remo.[45] *Pianda* here certainly has the sense of 'expiate', but in this case there may not be an idea of sacrifice. We know that Remus performed purifying rites, such as the Lupercalia, and a similar ritual may be alluded to here.[46] The context does not require Remus' death; of the other Roman *exempla*, only the Decii require a sense of willful self-sacrifice. The story of the Sibyl prophesying about Rome's future, including the absence of Remus from that future, has an analogue in Tibullus.[47] This parallel suggests an aspect of the Aeneas (or overall foundation) myth that is otherwise lost, in which the Sibyl prophesied about the twins.[48] The association of the Sibyl (or rather, the Sibylline books) and expiation suggests that this myth related the Sibyl's religious instructions to Remus.[49] The Sibylline books were most frequently consulted for prodigies, and offered a variety of different means of expiation, ranging from sacrifice to games to temple foundation. While it is difficult to deduce what Remus' expiation was, based on the surviving texts, it seems likely that this story called for a strong senatorial role. As Eric Orlin pointed out, "the Senate always maintained the ultimate authority over the [Sibylline] oracles."[50] This included deciding when consultation was necessary. The very fact of Remus' expiation itself underlines the importance of the senate's leadership.

The *exempla* before and the prophecy of Cassandra that immediately follows these lines nonetheless imply Remus' death. The Decii sacrificed themselves to ensure the success of the Roman army; Brutus killed his sons to ensure the continuation of the Republic; Caesar was murdered for Rome; even Troy was sacked. Thus, while the connection of Remus and foundation sacrifice is not assured by Propertius' words, the idea that Rome's glory is predicated

45 Prop. 4.1.49–50, "if once the Avernian tripod of the trembling Sibyl spoke of fields to be expiated by Aventine Remus." For the interpretation, see e.g. Rea 2007:41–2; Hutchinson 2006 *ad loc.* suggests that this may have positive connotations (Remus' death thus has a point, rather than being an accident). Greek *exempla* in Propertius are discussed by Fedeli 2004, but not these Roman examples.

46 On pollution and expiation in Rome, see e.g. Lennon 2013, with bibliography. Parker 1983, although focused on the Greek world, is still in many ways useful.

47 See Tib. 2.5, esp. 15–64 for the appeal to the Sibyl and the prophecy. For the intellectual connections between Tibullus and Propertius, see e.g. Solmsen 1961, Fantham 1997, and Lyne 1998 (concerned with Tib. 1 and Prop. 2); see also above, pp. 104–108.

48 Compare Verg. *Aen.* 6.84–97, dealing only with the immediate future. On this prophecy and Vergil's Sibyl, see e.g. Santangelo 2013:229–31.

49 For the Sibyl, see e.g. DH 4.62.2–5; Lact. *DivInst* 1.6.10–11; Serv. *Aen.* 6.72. See also Orlin 1997:76–97.

50 Orlin 1997:81.

on violence is clearly present. There is wordplay, too, on the *Avernian* Sibyl and *Aventine* Remus.[51] Such wordplay is more complex than simple homophones. In line 61, Propertius will call upon Ennius, which encourages a reader to think back on Ennius' Aventine Romulus. The roles of the twins have thus been swapped, indicating that they are interchangeable. But 'interchangeable' is not the same as 'without conflict'. The point here is that *Romulus* could have died instead, a disaster (perhaps) for Rome's history. The violence of the *exempla* again argues for the reading of *pudet* rather than *putet*: if a Roman is not ashamed of his wolfish past, he should be.

This violence makes the apparently triumphant lines 55–58 much more bitter.[52] The reference to the attempted building of walls recalls 3.9, reaffirming the identity of Propertius and Romulus. The walls in turn remind the reader of the twins' equal potential. If we recall the tradition that Remus lived to found his own city, which is found in other Augustan-era writers and therefore could have been available to Propertius, the invocation becomes more complex.[53] The possibility that Remus is also a founder brings additional resonance to Propertius' identification as both *Umbrian* poet and *Roman* Callimachus. The city had grown to encompass its once-foreign neighbors, such as Alba, Bovillae, and Gabii. As part of that process of integration, Propertius has himself become a new Romulus: he will build the walls anew by his poetic efforts.[54] This claim for Romulean status is accompanied by a quiet reminder of the other twin, as Propertius laments (perhaps sarcastically) the incapacity of his verse to handle the city's origins. This possibility of turning into a Remus, rather than a Romulus, is repeated at the end of the poem, as Propertius wishes for good omens.[55] The speech of Horos immediately following gently mocks the speaker for his ambitions, and leaves dangling the question of which twin Propertius truly resembles.

---

51 Often noted; see e.g. Hutchinson 2006 *ad loc.*

52 Prop. 4.1.55–8, *optima nutricum nostris lupa Martia rebus, / qualia creverunt moenia lacte tuo! / moenia namque pio coner disponere versu:/ ei mihi, quod nostro est parvus in ore sonus!* ("She-wolf of Mars, best of nurses for our affairs, what walls have grown from your milk! I will try to lay out the walls in pious verse; ah me, what a small voice is in my mouth!")

53 See works cited above, p. 27n10.

54 For the identification of Propertius and Romulus here, see e.g. Fantham 1997:132–3. Propertius' valuation of his own poetic authority is in line with what Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has described as the restructuring of Roman knowledge in the first century BCE; see, e.g., Wallace-Hadrill 2005 (more complete than *id.* 1997)

55 Prop. 4.1.67–8.

By aligning his own work with the foundation of the city, Propertius sets himself on a level not only with Augustus, but also with the statesmen of the Republic who identified with the founder. The novelty of Propertius' account lies in the changed medium: rather than earning Romulean status for salvation of the city or civic renewal, Propertius receives it for poetry. This is an eloquent statement of the shifting priorities in the Augustan era, and questions what it means to be a 'founder'. Does rewriting history create a new foundation? In the late 20s and teens BCE, as the Augustan building program began to change the appearance of the city, questions of this sort would have had immediate significance. The open possibility that Propertius could turn out to be a Remus, and not a Romulus, leaves the answer up to the reader. But the ambiguity in itself speaks to an evolving conception of foundation.

The apparent differences in the Remus tale in the Propertian corpus, like the variants seen in Dionysius and in Livy, testify to the continuing significance and flexibility of this legend in Rome. With multiple variants at their disposal, authors could rely on readers to follow allusions and to reach their own conclusions. In works of the Augustan era, authorial preference is not exclusive. With several possibilities or vague allusions, readers could choose what to think. We need not postulate a single, canonical version that took hold in the Augustan era; the versatility of the myth made it a more useful and dynamic tool.

Ovid

Ovid's use of Romulus in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* is more in keeping with Augustan ideology than the Romulus we saw in Livy and Dionysius. This is not to say that Ovid is 'pro-' or 'anti-' Augustan, a polarizing stance that has been rightly questioned.[56] Rather, his poetry shows an awareness of Augustus' depiction of the twins, and in particular of the emphasis on Romulus' regal deeds. The Ovidian account of Romulus is extensive, and as I have already discussed his account of the Lupercalia and Parilia, I here examine only the death of Remus.

56 The classic work remains Kennedy 1992; see also Hinds 1992a and 1992b, Feeney 1992, Labate 2010. Green 2004a:11–2 offers a review of relevant scholarship. See Hinds 1987:99–134 for an analysis of similarities between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, although relating to Persephone rather than Roman myth; both works are roughly contemporary, begun c. 2 CE. For the date and composition of the *Fasti*, including the thorny question of its completion, see Green 2004a:15–21, with bibliography.

This episode is not presented in a static fashion across Ovid's work, although it is presented at length. Romulus is sometimes blamed for and sometimes absolved of guilt in his brother's death. The overwhelming majority of references to the founder, however, are positive; his negative depiction is limited to a comparison between Romulus and Augustus. This ambiguity, moreover, seems absent from the less detailed references in the *Metamorphoses*. Taken together, this implies that Ovid was more interested in depicting the founder in a positive light. Although this has sometimes been understood as Ovid pandering to (or subtly undercutting) the Augustan regime,[57] I prefer to see his favorable depiction of Romulus as a reminiscence of earlier accounts, such as the Ennian depiction discussed in chapter one. This reminder shifts away from the negative Romulus that had become more prevalent during the civil wars, and indicates a solidification of the Romulean discourse around Augustus' own use of the founder. This helps explain the subsequent disappearance of the twins in later imperial literature. Moreover, by exculpating Romulus (at least for the most part), Ovid exposes the logical extreme of the problem of elite competition: if 'better' (than peers, ancestors, etc.) is best, then the result is a king. The tension inherent in dyadic rivalry can only be resolved through the establishment of centralized power, which had by Ovid's day clearly become Rome's new government.

The Fasti

In the *Fasti*, Romulus' guilt in regard to Remus is initially contrasted with Augustus' clemency.[58] This sentence is part of an encomium to the *princeps* that offers a characterization of Romulus otherwise out of keeping with the depiction of the founder in the rest of the poem.[59] Only here is Ovid's depiction of Romulus anything other than positive.

Fabio Stok has interpreted the Romulus of the *Fasti* as purposefully ambiguous. Ovid offers his reader both the "traditional", Augustan Romulus, and his own alternative—which is, perhaps surprisingly, even more complimentary.[60]

---

57 E.g., Hinds 1992:114; Littlewood 2001:916–17, with some bibliography.

58 Ov. *F.* 2.143, *te Remus incusat, veniam dedit hostibus ille* ("Remus accuses you, he pardons his enemies").

59 See Stok 1991, esp. pp. 191–8; Hinds 1992b:127–34; Robinson 2011:138 points out that this is the only direct comparison between Romulus and Augustus to survive.

60 Stok 1991:210–11; cf. Barchiesi 1997:169, who refers to Ovid's "attentive readers, capable of interpreting Ovid's shades of meaning and innovations." Reading so much into Ovid's account presupposes that there would also be readers who would understand his tales

The contrast implicitly slights Augustus, according to Stok, by undercutting the 'traditional Romulus' whom Augustus promoted as the founder of the city. This position follows Stephen Hinds' influential argument that Ovid's completely militarized depiction of Romulus challenges Augustus' "synthetic and integrative" vision of the founder as "a model statesman of piety, moderation, justice and bravery."[61] Augustus himself was famously better at governance than at war.[62] Although this may reflect a later conception of Augustus than contemporaries had, it is an opinion more likely to be shared by Ovid. Unlike his earlier counterparts Propertius or Vergil, Ovid could not remember the bloodthirsty youth at Perusia or Nursia.

Hinds' study is important, but misrepresents Augustus. Augustus' Romulus is a warrior as well: he is the bearer of the *spolia*, the highest military honors available to a Roman general. This is the way that the *princeps* chose to represent the founder in his own Forum. Augustus did not shy away from military associations; as we see in the very first lines of the *Res Gestae*, he trumpets his military achievements.[63] Criticism of Romulus can be praise of Augustus when the *princeps* is marked as an improvement on the model.[64] This interpretation need not conflict with Hinds' larger argument that Ovid in *Fasti* 3 depicts war and peace as oppositional and embodied by Romulus and Numa, respectively;[65] the *Fasti*, however, is a poem notable for its shifting explanations of various customs, and the polarity of the third book does not fit the Romulus that we see elsewhere in the poem.

Our interpretation of the Ovidian Romulus changes in part based on how the relationship between Ovid and Augustus is defined.[66] This is a complex ques-

---

simply as presented. On the tendency to overstress Ovid's irony, see Pasco-Pranger 2002:273–4.

61 Hinds 1992b:131; 142.

62 E.g., Suet. *Aug*. 13.1; 16.1; 20.

63 *RDGA* 1.1; 2–4.3.

64 See Smith 2007 on Brutus as a better version of Romulus. Depiction of oneself as an 'improved Romulus' goes back to at least Cicero; see above, p. 68–69.

65 Hinds 1992a and b. For the shifting aetiologies, see e.g. Miller 1992.

66 The bibliography on Ovid is immense, and most work on the *Fasti* at least briefly mentions the poet's relationship with Augustus. Fantham 1995 provides a review of trends until the date of publication, including the works of Barchiesi 1997 (trans.) and Herbert-Brown 1994. See also Feeney 1992; Newlands 1995a, esp. 1–26; Herbert-Brown (ed.) 2002, esp. the contributions of Pasco-Pranger (about the calendrical form, the poetic form, and Ovid's engagement with the imperial household) and Littlewood (on the *Fasti*'s relationship with both the *Georgics* and the Forum Augustum); Murgatroyd 2005; and the wealth of companions to Ovid (Brill and Cambridge, both 2002; Blackwell, 2009).

tion, and the relationship between poet and *princeps* was by no means static through the writing of the *Fasti*, much less through Ovid's lifetime. The *Fasti* was still being completed during Ovid's exile, which complicates the issue of how to interpret its depictions of Augustus and Augustan figures such as Romulus. Scholars have variously suggested that Ovid is trying to ingratiate himself with Augustus through these poems, or to seem to ingratiate himself while actually mocking or criticizing him.[67] The latter argument is much more common in recent scholarship. There are merits to both arguments, and I do not feel confident that Ovid's position can be determined. Such ambiguity is purposeful on the part of the poet. Pandering held social stigma, as the sycophant had a negative image in both Greece and Rome. At the same time, it seems likely that Ovid truly did want to return to Rome, and criticizing the most powerful man in the city was a poor means of achieving that.[68] Regardless of Ovid's actual opinion of the *princeps*, the underlying idea that Augustus found in Romulus a convenient means of conveying a public, political message, and that this Augustan use of the founder has shaped Ovid's own authorial choices, is both plausible and in keeping with most expressed opinions.

In the *Fasti*, Romulus is lionized as the pious founder of the city, despite the death of his brother. When Ovid recounts the death of Remus, he does not directly accuse Romulus of fratricide. Indeed, in this version Romulus plays only a small role:

augurio laeti iaciunt fundamina cives,
  et novus exiguo tempore murus erat.
hoc Celer urget opus, quem Romulus ipse vocarat,
  'sint' que, 'Celer, curae' dixerat 'ista tuae,
neve quis aut muros aut factam vomere fossam

67 Recent work is frequently more nuanced; e.g., Feeney 1992 and Barchiesi 1997. Gosling 2002:51–2 neatly summarizes the various positions.

68 It strikes me as naive to believe that criticism apparent to us would not also have been apparent to Augustus or his readers; the *princeps* was a savvy reader, although his tolerance for free speech may have been high, at least in some periods. In my discussion of Augustan-era literary works, I have generally followed Fergus Millar's attitude towards inscribed documents of the period: "we should not brush these words aside as insincere (which we cannot know and which in any case is irrelevant) or as misapprehensions of some privileged reality which is knowable in some other way. For these public expressions *are* a significant part of what we can know of the reality…" (Millar 1984b:56). Poetry, too, is a public text, if aimed at a narrower audience than public statuary. This is not to say, of course, that no author left room for suggestive interpretation; a nuanced view is preferable.

> transeat; audentem talia dede neci.'
> quod Remus ignorans humiles contemnere muros
> coepit, et 'his populus' dicere 'tutus erit?'
> nec mora, transiluit: rutro Celer occupat ausum;
> ille premit duram sanguinulentus humum.
> haec ubi rex didicit, lacrimas introrsus obortas
> devorat et clausum pectore volnus habet.
> flere palam non volt exemplaque fortia servat,
> 'sic' que 'meos muros transeat hostis' ait.[69]

Ovid's account shows several differences even from Dionysius, whose version is the most similar. First is the characterization of Remus as unaware of Romulus' prohibition. In the Greek version, Remus instigated his brother and seemed determined to bring about his own end. In contrast, Ovid's version has Remus engaged in friendly ribbing.

Remus' words also show that Ovid worked within the tradition of productive rivalry. Unlike in Diodorus, or even the relatively sympathetic Dionysius, Remus is not envious or sarcastic. Rather, he is concerned for the safety of the people (*hic populus … tutus erit*, line 842). His helpful character suggests a version of the story that is sympathetic to both brothers, thus increasing the tragedy of Remus' death. We are presented with two youths who could have been effective partners, as we saw in the productive competition of the second century.[70] By jumping over the wall, Remus tries to inspire Romulus to build faster and more effectively. The speed of construction has already been expressed (line 836); the speed with which tragic events unfold is equally marked. Remus dies in a single couplet that begins "without delay" (*nec mora*, line 836). Although Wiseman did not note this passage, it fits well with his argument that Remus is the slow twin whose hasty acts bring about his own destruction.[71] Celer, on the other hand, is created for quick movement; he does

69 Ov. *F.* 4.835–48, "The citizens, happy at the augury, laid the foundations. Soon there was a new wall. Celer urged the work on. Romulus had called to him and said, 'Celer, let this be your task: no one should cross the walls or the ditch made by my plow; kill anyone who dares it.' Remus, ignorant of this command, began to mock the humble walls and said, 'These will keep the people safe?' Without delay, he leapt across. Celer struck the one who dared mock with his shovel, and Remus, bloodied, hit the hard earth. When the king learned of these things, he repressed his rising tears and kept the wound closed up in his heart. He did not want to weep openly and he preserved the appearance of strength, saying, 'Thus may the enemy cross my walls.'"

70 See chapter two.

71 See Wiseman 1995a:111; he cites only Ov. *F.* 5.

not stop to think before he carries out orders. His swift actions are successful, and Remus dies.

The agency of Celer is not unparalleled, but Ovid's subsequent focus on Romulus' grief is. In the *Fasti*, Romulus mourns his brother deeply. This is something that we never see in the earlier accounts, which concentrate on his final words about crossing the wall.[72] Although Dionysius does mention that Romulus was upset (1.87.3), he does so in just one sentence, and the founder recovers quickly. The founder's deep emotional distress is unique to Ovid among surviving sources.[73] It is reinforced by Ovid's citation of Catullus at Remus' funeral: *osculaque adplicuit posito suprema feretro, / atque ait 'invito frater adempte, vale.'*[74] Catullus' brother died abroad, reminding the attentive reader of the importance of familial sacrifice for Rome. Still, the founder hides his grief and fails to chastise his brother's murderer. This ambiguous action could be read in a sinister way, with Romulus acting deceptively.[75] Byron

---

72 This has led some scholars, e.g. Ogilvie 1965:54 and Bremmer 1987:36, to consider the purpose of the myth to be an *aition* for the sanctity of walls, or otherwise dealing with wall taboos. Ogilvie further admits that this is a generally Greek theme, but one which is found in Fest. 358L. Festus at this point says: ***rituales** nominantur Etruscorum libri, in quibus perscribtum est, quo ritu condantur urbes … qua sanctitate muri …* The mention of walls is only one in a long list. This lemma is thus a fragile hook for the entire argument to hang on. Bremmer 1987:35 admits as much when he says that "these [Greek] stories do not fully explain the manner of Remus' death." The theme also appears in the *Digest* (1.8.11), where Remus' death is cited as a reason why violating walls is a capital offense. It seems more likely that the *Digest* is latching on to a prominent example here, though, rather than that the story itself is an *aition*.

73 Although this may be a reference to an earlier version, it seems dangerous to form a conclusion on this point. As I argued in chapter two, accounts of the twins from the second century depict the brothers in a more positive light. Because the manner of Remus' death is unclear in Ennius and does not survive at all in Hemina, it is safer to conclude that this version is mostly Ovid. Praise of the founder, such as we see here, seems more consistent with these second-century versions of the tale.

74 Ov. *F.* 4.851–2, "When the bier was set down, he gave the body its last kisses and said, 'O brother who was taken from me unwillingly, farewell.'" The Catullan reference is to *Carm.* 101. This is not the only example of Romulus' grief in the *Fasti*; we see him mourn his twin again after the return of Remus to Acca and Faustulus in book 5 (on which see the excellent analysis of Littlewood 2001). It is noteworthy that Ovid gives the sentiment to Romulus. Ogilvie 1965:54 comments that Vergil too was interested in absolving Romulus from blame, but his only evidence for this is *Aen.* 1.292; the significance of this line is not so clear, as we have seen. Hinds 1992b:142–9 suggests a more negative interpretation of the allusion; that the scene can be read both ways reinforces the complexity of Ovid's account.

75 As the Greek historians have him doing at the augury contest; see e.g. Wiseman 1995a:9–12.

Harries has argued that Ovid's invocation of Quirinus at the beginning of the episode means that the tale is a biased one: this is Romulus' rhetorical version of the story.[76] But Quirinus is not *telling* the story; he is only guaranteeing its authenticity. Ovid's own authorial imprimatur remains on the tale as well. And it can be read as sympathetic: Romulus promotes unity for the city when faced with personal disaster. Romulus' acts here in keeping his emotions hidden are more similar to Brutus' stoniness when watching the deaths of his traitorous sons,[77] a scene that is usually considered flattering to the founder of the Republic.

The complexity of Ovid's depiction is similarly clear in his evaluation of Remus' death. In the *Fasti*, Remus eventually absolves Romulus of blame: *noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est: / quod potuit, lacrimas manibus ille dedit.*[78] The ghost of Remus appears to his foster parents at the Lemuria, according to Ovid a festival meant to placate restless ghosts.[79] Ver Eecke argues that we should read this as a lament for Caesar, but this is an unsatisfying interpretation.[80] Although she rightly connects Remus' assertion of fraternal *pietas* with one of Augustus' cornerstone virtues, the connection between Remus and Caesar does not make sense in the Ovidian context.[81] The founder's lack of guilt is difficult to explain in terms of filial *pietas*; Augustus was clearly not to blame for his adoptive father's death, even by the agency of a 'Celer'. At this point, the parallelism between Remus and Caesar falls apart.[82] Similarly, Remus' satisfaction with Romulus' tears does not seem parallel to the situation with Caesar, whose death Augustus brutally avenged. The battles at Philippi, the murders at Nursia, the temple of Mars Ultor—all indicate that tears were not perceived to be sufficient for Caesar's ghost.

---

76 Harries 1989:170–1; invocation at Ov. *F.* 4.807–8.

77 E.g., Livy 2.4; discussed below, pp. 201–202.

78 Ov. *F.* 5.471–2, "My brother did not want this; he has an equal devotion. He gave my ghost what he could—tears."

79 On the restless dead as a motivation for colonization in Greek literature, see Dougherty 1993:180–86; Ovid's account of Remus here inverts that narrative pattern. Although Dougherty is concerned primarily with Pindaric evidence, it is not unlikely that Callimachus' *Aetia* (or other later works) had similar themes, which Ovid may be manipulating.

80 ver Eecke 2008:464–8.

81 The importance of *pietas* is not unique to Augustan ideology; see e.g. Cic. *DRP* 6.16. But while in Cicero *pietas* is strongly connected to one's country, Augustus' *pietas* is personal.

82 The equation Romulus = Caesar and Remus = Pompey makes far more sense in this context; Caesar was later said to have wept at Pompey's death (see Plut. *Pomp.* 80.5). I would like to thank Hugh Mason for drawing my attention to this parallel.

Ver Eecke also argues that Caesar transformed from 'Romulus' (in 46–44 BCE) to 'Remus' (after 44 BCE) based on the bloody appearance of Remus to Romulus at the beginning of the Lemuria episode.[83] While the parallelism of Remus' appearance to Faustulus and Romulus' appearance to Proculus Julius in the *Fasti* is intriguing,[84] this should not be understood as a program of assimilating Remus to Caesar. Instead, the association here is better understood as parallelism between the twins themselves. As they were equals at birth, they are again equals in death, able to reappear on earth to explain their wishes. This similarity fits neatly into the twins' depiction as equals in most respects, but with a superior destiny for Romulus. Remus returns as a ghost; Romulus returns as a god. Both epiphanies may indeed have divine associations. But Caesar's association with a deified Romulus is stronger and was accepted during his own lifetime.[85]

A similar association exists between Augustus and Romulus. The two are compared explicitly in Ovid's commemoration of the granting of the title *pater patriae*,[86] which invites the reader to continue seeing Augustus in Romulus' appearances throughout the poem. In the scene of the foundation, the mocking words of Remus and his subsequent, too-quick death may be a reminder of Ovid's 'death' for his words: exile. Danielle Porte has argued that the *Fasti* itself was the cause of Ovid's exile;[87] while her argument requires too much chronological reworking to be fully convincing, it remains possible that Ovid retold the Remus tale with his own experiences in mind.

A perhaps more likely parallel can be found between the death of Remus and the death of Drusus. Augustus himself preferred to align the imperial family with Castor and Pollux than Romulus and Remus.[88] The rebuilding and rededication of both the Temple of Castor and Pollux and the Temple of Concordia were carried out in the names of Tiberius and Drusus, drawing (as Geoffrey Sumi has pointed out) a nexus of idealized brotherhood and state harmony.[89] Yet both temples were only dedicated after Drusus had died. This may have been fortuitous, but it worked in Augustus' favor. No subsequent strife could occur between these brothers; their ideal harmony, visible in Tiberius' fervent

---

83 Ov. *F.* 5.473–83; ver Eecke 2008:464.

84 ver Eecke 2008:464–8; Ov. *F.* 2.497–512. See also Littlewood 2001:927, not noted by ver Eecke: the twins are equal but opposite (similarly Littlewood 2001:917).

85 See above, pp. 100n47 and 113–117 and 130–3.

86 Ov. *F.* 2.127–44.

87 Porte 1984.

88 See chapter five.

89 Sumi 2009:185–6; see also Champlin 2011 and Green 2004b:230.

show of grief, would endure. Tiberius' mourning recalls the grief Ovid attributes to Romulus, suggesting that an ideal relationship, among Roman brothers, is only possible after one is dead. The sentiment may be tongue-in-cheek, but the commentary can also register as a sincere memorial.

There are many options when examining Ovid's depiction of the twins in comparison to political figures past and present. A more open reading that takes advantage of this polysemity is preferable to determining a single, static 'meaning' of the poem. There is no need to abandon reference to Caesar; his murder was a shocking event that dominated the political discourse of the next several years. It may have given rise to literary echoes without the explicit (or conscious) identification of the dictator with a specific mythological character. It is perhaps more likely that Romulus and Remus should here be seen as Augustus and Agrippa. The latter's death may indeed have seemed suspicious in Rome (and was far closer in time to Ovid than Caesar's). This parallelism was recognized in antiquity, and is still upheld in scholarship.[90] But Augustus' conscious self-identification with Romulus did not entail the presence of a contemporary Remus; in fact, such a Remus would have been detrimental to Augustus' self-fashioning. In the Augustan era, Remus was a reminder of civil war.

Because of the association of Remus with conflict, it is easy to dismiss Ovid's stress on Romulus' grief as a politically necessary change. But this does a disservice to Ovid, whose poem is more nuanced. Romulus' instruction at line 840, *dede neci*, quotes a significant passage of Vergil's *Georgics*.[91] In the fourth book of this poem, Vergil gives advice on the cultivation of bees, a politically active community that parallels Rome. The parallels between the bee community and Rome's foundation are apparent from early in the book. As the bees go forward from the hive, Vergil describes them as *novi reges* surrounded by youths, and recommends that a beekeeper place their hive near a stream and a tree.[92] This location is similar to the description of the Lupercal, also near a

90 The parallelism of Romulus and Remus with Augustus and Agrippa goes back to Servius (*Aen.* 1.292); discussed by Beaujeu 1974:68–72, Porte 1984, Wiseman 1995a:144–6 (also cf. p. 149 for a potential association of Remus with Agrippa Postumus), and ver Eecke 2008:464 (who does not consider this parallel incompatible with that of Augustus and Caesar).

91 The parallel is noted by Littlewood 2001:931n46, who connects it to "the idea of sacrifice for the good of the community."

92 Verg. *Geor.* 4.21–4 on the importance of correctly siting one's hive: *cum prima novi ducent examina reges / vere suo ludetque favis emissa iuventus, / vicina invitet decedere ripa calori, / obviaque hospitiis teneat frondentibus arbos* ("When the new kings lead out their first swarms, truly the youth play, released from the comb; then the nearby banks invite them to escape the heat and the tree on their route holds welcoming fronds.") The poem dates

river (the Tiber) and tree (the *ficus*). These parallels are reminiscent of the situation of the twins. While Vergil is not necessarily modeling his advice on the tale of Romulus and Remus,[93] it is nonetheless a reminder of how prevalent the imagery of the founder's early life (and therefore of dyadic rivalry) was in the late Republic and early Augustan eras.

Sometimes in a hive there are two king bees, leaders who stir up war amongst their followers. This war is also described in terms reminiscent of the foundation as *duobus / regibus . . . discordia.*[94] In such a situation, Vergil recommends that the beekeeper kill the weaker king so that the stronger king can thrive: *Verum ubi ductores acie revocaveris ambo / deterior qui visus, eum, ne prodigus obsit, / dede neci; melior vacua sine regnet in aula.*[95] As discussed in chapter one, this is the general problem faced in tales of dyadic rivalry. Ovid's use of the same command lets the reader know which version of Remus' death is coming, and suggests that Celer's murder of Remus was not accidental. The beekeeper's role is here split between Romulus and Celer: Romulus realizes that two men cannot share power, but it is Celer who must eliminate the weaker twin.

But Ovid's presentation is not so simple as Celer doing a distasteful task for his leader. This version of Remus' death contains significant echoes of the second-century accounts of the twins as well. One echo in particular suggests that the death of Remus represents a resolution to the tension within the pattern of dyadic rivals. At the end of the wall scene, Ovid, like Livy, has Romulus respond to Remus' death with a maxim that recalls Scipio's quotation of Homer, which I discussed in detail in chapter three: *'sic' que 'meos muros transeat hostis'.*[96] If

---

to c. 29 BCE. On the importance of siting a city, see e.g. Cic. *DRP* 2.5–11, although without significant verbal parallels.

93 Servius *ad loc.*, for example, says nothing about the founders. Thomas 1988 *ad loc.* cautions against seeing "a strict equation" between the king bees and the recent civil wars.

94 Verg. *Geor.* 4.67–8, *Sin autem ad pugnam exierint, nam saepe duobus / regibus incessit magno discordia motu* ("But if they have gone out to fight—for often dissent breaks out between two kings to great upheaval . . .")

95 Verg. *Geor.* 4.88–90, "when you shall have recalled both leaders from the battle, in order to avoid waste, hand over the one that seems weaker to be killed: let the better one reign in an empty castle." See also lines 210–12, where the bees honor their king and *rege incolumni mens omnibus una est* ("all have but one mind when the king is unhurt," line 212); this sentiment is echoed in Livy's description of Fabius and Decius (above, pp. 31–32). The close proximity of dates between the *Georgics* and *Ab Urbe Condita* suggests a mutual cultural influence, rather than strict imitation.

96 Ov. *F.* 4.848; cf. Livy 1.7.1. The quotation itself is ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι (*Od.* 1.47). For further discussion, cf. above, pp. 76–77; for Ovid's reading of Livy, see e.g. Hinds 1992a:29; Robinson 2011:454.

we combine Romulus' two statements in Ovid (*dede neci … [qui] meos muros transeat hostis*), we in fact have the essence of the Homeric quotation, making allowance for the difference in subject matter: the man who dares to cross the wall must die.

The combination suggests that Ovid is aware of the origin of Livy's statement; rather than simply copying the historian, he borrows the theme and takes it a step further. The original Homeric passage, about Aegisthus, made it clear who was in the wrong. Remus is here equated not with Caesar, but with Aegisthus. Under the surface, then, Ovid may be suggesting that Remus too was wrong. Although the losing twin was trying to hasten the work along, he oversteps. Without taking the time to think, Remus jumps across the city walls. His ignorance may partially absolve him; his actions, like the agency of Celer, absolve Romulus from direct blame.

Ovid does not refer to a particular event in the civil wars, such as the conflict between Octavian and Antony; at this time, such a reference would have lost its immediacy. Augustus' dominance by the early years of this era had been solidified for more than two decades, and was no longer in the process of negotiation. Instead, both poets end up suggesting the same thing: the rule of two is dangerous, the rule of one perhaps less so. This is the case even when neither king is the agent of the other's destruction: in Ovid it is Celer who murders Remus, while in Vergil the beekeeper kills the weaker king.

Celer's guilt is emphasized by Remus himself later in the poem. The excuse that Remus presents for Romulus is noteworthy: *noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est*.[97] Remus here presents himself as Romulus' equal, at least in regard to fraternal virtue. Their parity is strengthened by the proximity of *frater … aequalis*, and the central position of *pietas* underscores that virtue is its cause. Remus' statement looks back to the Ennian depiction of the brothers as equals, suggesting that before his death, equality and shared power were still viable options. The concomitant realization that this opportunity has passed, although it might be reminiscent of the loss of the Republic, does not necessarily imply that such a loss must be mourned. Romulus' Rome is a productive society, and Ovid more frequently emphasizes the beneficial aspects of Romulean rule. The poem in this way refracts the Augustan focus on Romulus as king.

97 Ov. *F.* 5.471, "My brother did not want this; he has an equal devotion."

The Metamorphoses

The significance of Ovid's decision to discuss Remus on multiple occasions in the *Fasti* becomes clearer when this poem is compared to the *Metamorphoses*. In the epic, he conspicuously refuses to discuss the controversial issues of Romulus' life. Although this may be expected in a poem that is so clearly devoted to themes separate from the foundation of the city, Romulus' life story is recollected in fifty lines as a prelude to his eventual apotheosis.[98] This account avoids any indication of trouble, but does so by entirely eliminating Remus from the story. In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid says merely *Numitorque senex amissa nepotis / munere regna capit, festisque Palilibus urbis / moenia conduntur.*[99] By using the singular *nepotis*, Ovid avoids the problem of having to relate the Remus narrative. At the same time, he effectively denies even the possibility of shared power: Romulus has no one to share it with. He is no longer one of two, but a single ruler with an unquestioned right to authority.

The appearance of the lone Romulus here goes even further than Cicero's idealized Romulus in the *de Re Publica*. Cicero at least acknowledged that Romulus was at one point one of two, while Ovid completely denies twinship. By producing this version of Romulus' biography as a prelude to his apotheosis, Ovid implies that it is the most laudable option. Freed from the question of his brother's murder, Romulus here is simply a virtuous king. But Ovid also recalls the twinship by his quotation of Ennius at line 814 (*unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli*). In Ennius, we can imagine that the stress on *unus* at the beginning of the line emphasized choice: once there had been two twins, but only one of them would become a god. With only one possible son in the *Metamorphoses*, the significance of that *unus* changes. The reader is all too aware that the founders of Rome were twins, and also would have known the full original quotation. Even a highly idealized biography, then, cannot keep silent about Remus.[100] The *unus* stands as a stark reminder of what is missing under Augustus: the productive rivalry of the mid-Republican elite. Romulus, like Augustus, is an unopposed ruler.

---

98 Ov. *Met.* 14.772–828.

99 Ov. *Met.* 14.773–5, "the aged Numitor regained his lost kingdom with the help of his grandson and the city walls were established at the Palilia."

100 See Hinds 1992b:143 for a more negative assessment of the twins in Ovid; Elm von der Osten 2006 for parallelism between the elegiac persona (under the dominance of a mistress) and the Roman elite in the Principate (under the dominance of Augustus); similarly, King 2006:221 on the Lupercalia.

Ovid's vision of Romulus is strongly influenced by Augustan ideology. The founder is absolved from involvement in his brother's death and depicted as a virtuous king. In some ways, this positive picture represents a return to what I have argued were themes of earlier Republican accounts of Romulus and Remus. Unlike the accounts of the mid-first century, the Augustan and second-century versions both offer relatively favorable depictions of Romulus as a virtuous figure whose deeds should be imitated. But the earlier depiction of the founder is not identical to Ovid's. As I argued in the first chapter, Romulus' story initially betrayed a tension between the ideals of Republican collegiality and aristocratic ambition; in Ovid's works and in Augustan ideology, we see the resolution of that tension via the idealized kingship of Rome's founder. This change is not necessarily a sign of Ovid's obeisance to Augustus; with the disappearance of rivalry comes the disappearance of the Republic. Ovid's poems allow the reader to determine the value of this change. The founder's role in Ovid indicates the poet's awareness of the new social norms, as well as the mark that these changing values left on Republican traditions.

Trogus

The absence of Remus from the *Metamorphoses* is exactly the opposite of what we find in the universal history of Pompeius Trogus. This work, originally written under Augustus by a Romanized Gaul, now survives only in a later epitome.[101] It is difficult to tell what elements of this text are originally Trogus', and thus can be connected with the period of this study; John Yardley's monograph on the language of the epitome remains the most thorough contribution.[102] Although Yardley argues that the influence of Justin remains underestimated in this work, he offers no opinion on the most important section of the history for the death of Remus: namely, the omission of Remus' death from Trogus' narrative of early Rome. As I will argue, however, Trogus' account is similar to Ovid's in one way: both authors avoid the issue of elite competition and instead respond to a world in which a single leader is dominant.

Trogus' surviving account of Italian mythological history is brief, appearing in a few chapters at the beginning of book forty-three. The twins' story spans

101 For the date of the original, see Trogus 43.5.11–12 and Alonso-Núñez 1987; Yardley suggests that the epitome was from the second century CE (e.g., Yardley 2003:3–5 with bibliography, also arguing for a stronger presence of Justin in the work than usually assumed).

102 Yardley 2003.

two chapters.[103] Like Livy, Trogus begins his account of the twins by referring to the troubles between Amulius and Numitor.[104] He then spends a sentence or so on their upbringing, the Lupercalia and restoration of Numitor, and finally, the foundation of the city. The latter is told as follows:

> Occiso Amulio regnum Numitori restituitur et urbs Romana ab adulescentibus conditur. Tunc et senatus centum seniorum, qui patres dicti sunt, constituitur; tunc et vicinis conubia pastorum dedignantibus virgines Sabinae rapiuntur.[105]

Two points stand out in Trogus' account: first, that the city is founded by both brothers (*ab adulescentibus*), not just one. This seems similar to the account found in Cassius Hemina, although it is perhaps going too far to say that Trogus had read Hemina.[106] It does indicate, though, that even in the Augustan period the city's foundation could be viewed as a joint endeavor. The likelihood of the dual foundation being part of Trogus' work (rather than Justin's interpretation) is reinforced by the use of a similar plural in his contemporary Strabo's *Geography*.

Also important is the fact that this account omits any mention of Remus' death. Trogus seems to have known this story, for he mentions earlier, in a speech of the Acarnanians, that the Romans lived in a city founded via

103 Trogus 43.2.1–3.2, including the fight between Amulius and Numitor.

104 See Yardley 2003:20–78, arguing for extensive Livian influence; I am hesitant to dismiss the possibility of a common Latinity as opposed to direct influence, particularly given our ignorance of the relative dates of composition of these authors.

105 Trogus 43.3.1–2, "When Amulius had been killed, the kingdom was restored to Numitor and the city of Rome was founded by the young men [Romulus and Remus]. At that time, the senate of one hundred elders (who are called 'fathers') was established; at the same period, the Sabine girls were kidnapped because the neighbors did not think that the shepherds were worthy of legitimate marriage."

106 See above, pp. 49–53. DS 37.11.1, Str. 5.3.2, and Conon *FrGrHist* 26 F1.48 also imply that the twins founded the city together. Yet these accounts are not only extremely brief, but also epitomized. The late Augustan Strabo, whose work alone survives in full, has other concerns, and indicates that Remus died at the foundation. The fragments of Diodorus book 8 also mention Remus' death at the foundation. It is difficult to say whether Strabo and Conon are using the plural carelessly or whether they have combined two different accounts. Dueck 1999 and 2000:183–6 discuss Strabo's working methods and sources; Lasserre 1967:77–9 suggests that Polybius and, through him, Fabius Pictor are likely to be Strabo's primary sources for Rome; Wiseman 1995a:9–11 takes both passages as evidence for a tradition of joint foundation (see *OGR* 23.1 and 23.6); Cohen-Skalli 2007, on the other hand, argues strongly that Diodorus related the 'vulgate' tale (see esp. pp. 235–40).

fratricide.[107] Yardley has suggested that this speech shows evidence of being Justin's creation.[108] This in turn may suggest that Trogus himself did not mention it, and that perhaps the later book, with its more positive vision of Remus, provides us with Trogus' actual view. As a Gaul, Trogus may have wanted to integrate the losing rival more closely with the foundation as a means of connecting outsiders with Rome. This would be especially relevant if there were a tradition in which Remus founded his own city elsewhere, a possibility that seems likely based on surviving Greek evidence.

This scenario must remain only a suggestion, however. There are great uncertainties surrounding the authorship of any given part of this work, and we know little about Trogus. Additionally, the condensed nature of epitomes requires that some material from the original text be omitted. Remus' death may be one of those issues, and the ascription of the foundation to both twins may be simply Justin's carelessness. But given the multiple possibilities for this story that I have outlined above, Trogus' evidence should likewise not be dismissed. It may represent a more idyllic vision of the twins, an interpretation that fits well with the Augustan context of this work. Trogus would in this case be strongly influenced by Augustus' own presentation of the the founder and willing to gloss over the problem of elite competition.

The diversity of stories about the death of Remus imply that no single version gained complete authority. This was true even in the late first century, when a number of variants still circulated, and nearly every author refers to at least two. The Romulus and Remus story was not a static narrative or a collection of mix-and-match episodes. Rather, the founder's biography was actively used by ancient authors to conceive of and complicate contemporary politics and power dynamics. The central theme of the Romulus saga may be broadly understood as a means of problematizing collegial vs. individual authority and ambition; the weight that was put on either option varied. With Augustus, the importance of the individual was assured, but not without cost. Romans modeled themselves on their founder—but the founder was molded to the concerns of contemporary Romans.

107 Trogus 28.2.10, *urbem ipsam parricidio condiderint murorumque fundamenta fraterno sanguine adsperserint* ("[The Romans] founded their very city by murder and sprinkled their walls' foundations with brotherly blood").

108 Yardley 2003:211 bases the claim on parallels with Lucan, whom Trogus could not have read (but who could presumably have read Trogus).

Conclusion: Romulus and Remus

The more positive depiction of Romulus from the 20s on shows contemporary preoccupations with the origins of the city. Rather than emphasizing the productive competition between two men, these accounts stress the primacy of an individual over collaborative effort. This is not to say that the authors of these accounts approved of such primacy. The tales are reminiscent both of the events of the previous decades of civil war, where two men frequently fought over supremacy at Rome, and of the Augustan era, in which an individual gained control of the state.

These accounts of Romulus, although they show similar themes to Augustus' own political programs, do not merely parrot the *princeps*. For example, some writers used the death of Remus as a pendant to the strife at the end of the Republic; in contrast, Augustus made the founder a model for his own self-fashioning. To this end, he highlighted Romulus' glorious deeds as king, while glossing over the less-savory elements from his earlier career. In particular, Augustan imagery focused on Romulus as a military victor and avoided Remus. This is similar to the founder's appearance in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Horace's later work, but quite different from the Romulus seen in Livy, Dionysius, Propertius, and Ovid's *Fasti*.

Augustus' use of Romulean themes was extensive, and probably had multiple purposes. As the founder of a new Rome, Augustus saw the profit in associating himself with the initial founder of the city. As ver Eecke has argued, there were familial reasons to stress the founder as well; Julius Caesar, at the end of his life, had begun to focus on the *origines* as a source for his own political propaganda.[109] By taking up the Romulean theme, Augustus stressed his connection to Caesar. Such continuity can also be seen in, for example, Augustus' completion of Caesar's building projects. At the same time, Augustus explicitly chose not to use the name 'Romulus' as his title, almost certainly because of the unfavorable connotations that could still be attached to the founder.[110]

Augustus' focus on Romulus as a king, rather than his pre-monarchic years, perhaps indicated the approved path to later writers; it seems more likely, however, that the study of origins was abandoned by most imperial writers independently of Augustus' motives for promoting Romulus the *conditor*. The

---

109 See ver Eecke 2008:373–445.

110 ver Eecke 2008:445n1 points out that the augural associations of 'Augustus' still recall the first augur, Romulus; this idea goes back to Scott 1925. See also Green 2009 for augury in Augustan writers.

tradition that was fascinating to those living through the Augustan transition became less exciting in the Roman empire, and this too is important. Under a single ruler, writers idealized and imagined a functioning system of shared power.[111] Instead of the foundation of the city, they focused on the foundation of the Republic; the romanticized past lay in these consuls, not those kings.

111 See Muth 2012:14–21 for the disappearance of Republican honorific statuary from Rome's public spaces under Augustus' rebuilding. This iconographic silence parallels the literary silence.

CHAPTER 7

Parallels

Up to this point, I have focused on the founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus. Their relationship follows the same pattern in all sources: although the twins begin with a cooperative, power-sharing union, their story ends with Romulus ruling alone. This pattern is visible in other Roman legends as well. The use of the same narrative arc in several different tales of early Rome establishes dyadic rivalry as a paradigm, rather than simply an anomaly or idiosyncrasy of the foundation story. Because of the long time spent examining Romulus and Remus, a brief outline of the features of this pattern may be helpful before I turn to the narratives themselves.

What I call 'dyadic rivalry' is seen when two men at the head of state work cooperatively towards a concrete goal. At some point in their collaboration, one of the two dies or disappears from the story; the other goes on to become a crucial figure in Rome. The pattern as analyzed so far problematizes the interaction between elite ambition and Republican norms of competition, and ultimately reaffirms the value—whether positive or negative—of individual predominance in Roman thought. This value is asserted through fluctuating retellings of the dyadic rivals' actions, and sometimes through direct authorial statement.

In this chapter I examine three closely related narrative clusters: the tales of Romulus and Titus Tatius, Numitor and Amulius, and finally Brutus and Collatinus. These stories are attested primarily in the narratives of Dionysius and Livy, and are constructed in the Romulean mold. When possible, I compare the accounts of Dionysius and Livy to other surviving versions; however, these two authors present the vast majority of information about the figures I examine in this chapter, and provide the only narratives from the second or first centuries that are full, rather than fragmentary. As a result, while I here trace the same historical development as in the previous chapters, I cannot do so in such extensive detail.

In this material too we find multiple variants of the same tale. For the continuation of the Romulus story, this ambiguity is perhaps to be expected; for the other cases, it may be more surprising. Both Dionysius and Livy depict Brutus, the hero of the early Republic, far more bleakly than modern scholarship has usually assumed;[1] Livy, though, is more evasive in his message, while

1 See e.g. Ogilvie 1965 and Smith 2007 (Livy).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_009

Dionysius astonishingly depicts the founder of the Republic as a tyrant. Livy's uncertainty about the best presentation of Roman history comes through again in his account of the Alban kings Amulius and Numitor, which echoes Horace's concerns about the enduring curse of civic strife. The tension and rivalry inherent in the Romulus and Remus story was not isolated; rather, it was part of a discursive pattern about the nature of political power in Rome.

Romulus and Titus Tatius

Although Romulus and Remus offer the most famous attempt at power-sharing, this was not the only time the first king attempted joint rule. After his brother's death, Romulus tried to share the kingdom with the Sabine Titus Tatius. Our sources for this double monarchy are limited: although the partnership is alluded to by Cicero, the primary sources are Livy and Dionysius. The same attitude that we saw in their depiction of Romulus and Remus is visible in their treatment of Titus Tatius, which illustrates the late first-century trend towards emphasizing individual predominance. Romulus again tries to share power and fails, stressing that Rome's foundation required the leadership of a single king. This emphasis is colored in Dionysius' account by Augustus' refoundation of the city as sole ruler after the preceding decades of civil strife.

After the rape of the Sabine women, Romulus makes a treaty with the Sabine king Titus Tatius, in which they agree to rule jointly. As Livy says, *regnum consociant; imperium omne conferunt Romam. Ita geminata urbe, ita Sabinis tamen aliquid daretur, Quirites a Curibus appellati.*[2] Livy's account, although brief, is significant. He stresses the dual nature of the kingship with the word *consociant*; both root verb and prefix indicate the extension of power to a second party. It is the same *regnum* that had caused the original division between the twin founders.[3] This inconsistency may perhaps be seen as further evidence for an earlier and more positive version of Romulus' and Remus' relationship. Romulus' repeated attempts to rule with another indicate that collaboration was a desideratum. But the story is ambiguous: Titus Tatius might also be marked as unequal to Romulus, making their shared city possible.

2 Livy 1.13.5, "they shared the kingship and transferred all power to Rome. So the city was doubled, and the people were called Quirites, from Cures, so that the Sabines were given something." On the idea of doubling in Livy, see e.g. Konstan 1986.

3 For the question of *regnum* as sole or joint rule, see chapter 8 below; Martin 1982:56 nonetheless considers the reign with Titus Tatius inconsistent.

The nature of this joint rule remains unelaborated. Although the kingship is shared between Romulus and Titus Tatius, the seat of power is moved to Rome. This implies, perhaps unsurprisingly, that Rome was seen as having the upper hand in the treaty (even though the war between the two peoples had been inconclusive).[4] The newly-joined people are named after Titus Tatius' city, but this is an empty gesture when Rome has all of the *imperium*. It is not clear what the Sabines gain by sharing. Although Rome is the newer foundation, it becomes the joint city of the two peoples, and the Sabines are uprooted from their homeland. In Livy, this move may act as a reminder of Italian dislocation in the civil wars or the veteran settlements of the first century.

This is different from the account given by Dionysius. According to the Greek writer, the treaty was much more balanced:

> βασιλέας μὲν εἶναι Ῥωμαίων Ῥωμύλον καὶ Τάτιον ἰσοψήφους ὄντας καὶ τιμὰς καρπουμένους τὰς ἴσας, καλεῖσθαι δὲ τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ κτίσαντος τὸ αὐτὸ φυλάττουσαν ὄνομα Ῥώμην, καὶ ἕνα ἕκαστον τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ πολιτῶν Ῥωμαῖον, ὡς πρότερον, τοὺς δὲ σύμπαντας ἐπὶ τῆς Τατίου πατρίδος κοινῇ περιλαμβανομένους κλήσει Κυρίτας· πολιτεύειν δὲ τοὺς βουλομένους Σαβίνων ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἱερά τε συνενεγκαμένους καὶ εἰς φυλὰς καὶ εἰς φράτρας ἐπιδοθέντας.[5]

Dionysius emphasizes, as Livy does not, the equality of this settlement. Words indicating the unity of the new citizen body are repeated throughout: ἰσο-, συμ-, κοινή. His vocabulary echoes Hellenistic diplomatic language and emphasizes that privileges were shared between the two groups of citizens. And unlike in Livy, in Dionysius' account the Sabines have the option of remaining at home, rather than joining the new community. Indeed, he notes that few Sabines took advantage of the offer to move; in his version, only four households came from Cures to Rome, and one of them was that of Tatius himself.[6] The Sabines were

4 See Livy 1.11.5–13.4. Dionysius' much more elaborate account (2.36.3–46.1) relates constant fluctuation in the fortunes of battle. If anything, one might expect the Sabines to have the advantage in this war, since they had managed to capture Rome's citadel.

5 DH 2.46.2, "Romulus and Tatius would be kings of the Romans, with an equal voice and sharing equal honors. The city would be called Rome after its founder, keeping its name, and each one of the citizens would be called a Roman, as before, but the whole of them would be called Quirites, taking the name in common from Tatius' home city. Those of the Sabines who wished to be citizens at Rome would participate in sacrifices and be distributed into tribes and *curiae*."

6 DH 2.46.3, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι τὰς δυνάμεις ἀναλαβόντες ἡγεμόνες ἀπῆγον ἐπ' οἴκου, Τάτιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τρεῖς ἄνδρες οἴκων τῶν διαφανεστάτων ὑπέμειναν ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ τιμὰς ἔσχον, ἃς τὸ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐκαρποῦτο γένος, Οὐόλοσσος Οὐαλέριος καὶ Τάλλος Τυράννως ἐπίκλησιν καὶ

so numerous, however, that even these four households managed to double the size of Rome at that time.

This doubling recurs in Livy's account. He uses the word *geminata* to describe the newly-expanded city. 'Twin' is a rare word in Livy; he uses it seven times in book one, and before Titus Tatius only to refer to the founders.[7] Since all previous instances of this root in Livy have referred to Romulus and Remus, its use here recalls them, highlighting the fact that Romulus is a twin no longer. At the same time, it establishes Tatius as a new twin for Romulus.[8] Because of this, it also foreshadows the end of the relationship between Romulus and Titus Tatius. Again we find that the character of Romulus lends itself to a dyadic relationship, but this dualism fails. His consistent failure to share power reinforces the importance of individual predominance at a time of foundation, change, or strife. As we saw in the case of Remus, though, such an emphasis on the individual may conflict with cultural norms. This leads to dyadic rivalry.

Tatius is soon killed, although not by Romulus. Although Livy's account differs from Dionysius' here, both recount Tatius' murder in retaliation for perceived injustice.[9] Livy is vague about the details, but relates that Tatius is stoned to death at a sacrifice, much like Remus in the mêlée. Dionysius' account is longer, explaining that Tatius was murdered when he refused to prosecute his relatives for their mistreatment of ambassadors. As we will see, this account places Tatius in a similar position to Collatinus at the foundation

---

τελευταῖος Μέττιος Κούρτιος, ὁ τὴν λίμνην σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις διανηξάμενος, οἷς παρέμειναν ἑταῖροί τε καὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ πελάται, τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἀριθμὸν οὐκ ἐλάττους ("the other leaders, taking their troops, went home. Tatius the king remained at Rome, and with him three men from prominent houses, who were granted the honors which their descendants received from them. They were Volosius Valerius, Tallus called Tyrannius, and finally Mettius Curtius, who had swum across the lake with his weapons. With them remained their companions, relatives, and servants, no fewer in number than the natives").

7 Twins: Livy 1.4.1, Rhea/Ilia *geminum partum edidisset* ("gave birth to twins"); 1.5.6, Numitor *audisset … geminos esse fratres* ("heard that the brothers were twins"); 1.6.4, *quoniam gemini essent* ("because they were twins"), they needed to resort to augury about the foundation of the city. The verbal examples occur in the fight of the Horatii and Curiatii (1.25.11, Horatius' *geminata victoria* over the first two Curiatii), Tarquinius Priscus' doubling of the centuries (1.36.8), and Superbus' mingling of Latin and Roman troops (1.52.6). This usage is discussed by Konstan 1986.

8 Compare ver Eecke 2008:91; Tatius is Romulus' "ancien double." Skutsch 1985:254–5 compares the Ennian Romulus' judgment of his colleague's death (*Ann.* 104); there is a contrast between Romulus the good king and Titus Tatius the tyrant.

9 Livy 1.14.1–4; DH 2.51.1–52.5.

of the Republic, making a strong connection between Romulus with his two dyadic rivals and Brutus with just one.

According to Dionysius, the surviving king buried Tatius with due ceremony and prosecuted the murderers. This version teaches a lesson similar to the Celer variant of Remus' death. Romulus is not to blame; the failure of joint rule was not something he wanted. Livy tells a different and more sinister story. He states that *eam rem minus aegre quam dignum erat tulisse Romulum ferunt*.[10] This judgment indicates that Romulus preferred to rule alone. Although Romulus' innocence in this case cannot be questioned, unlike his role in the death of Remus, the death of his comrade is nonetheless both convenient and pleasant for the founder. This version portrays a more malicious Romulus than does Dionysius', and fits with Livy's more negative picture of Romulus and Remus discussed above. It also harks back to Cicero's condemnation of Romulus in *de Officiis*, with its strong connection to the political circumstances of the mid-40s. For Livy, the founder's motives remain questionable.

Ovid makes only a brief reference to this story in the *Metamorphoses*, but it is pointed. Tatius becomes king only to die in the next line, emphasizing the brevity of his rule: *Tatiumque accedere regno. / Occiderat Tatius*.[11] *Regnum* occupies the central position here, with Tatius' name bookending the account of his life. Such structuring suggests that the kingship not only drew Tatius to Rome, but also killed him.[12] In the next line, the poet addresses Romulus as the new lawgiver of the combined people: *Romule, iura dabas*.[13] This is a clear reference to Vergil's description of the twin founders at the beginning of the *Aeneid*.[14] The association of Remus and Titus Tatius recalls both the violent death of Remus and the potential for peaceful rule envisioned by Vergil. Stok argued that it is more likely to see in this allusion a reference to an earlier, peaceful version of the myth than to the rule of the twins over the shepherds.[15] Nonetheless, Ovid stresses that this lawgiving occurs only *after* Tatius is dead. The timing undercuts any possibility that this line can refer to shared power. Deification is for sole rulers, not the joint leaders of the people. The connection

10 Livy 1.14.3, "they say that Romulus took this affair less badly than he should have."

11 Ov. *Met*. 14.804–5, "Tatius came to the throne. Tatius died."

12 The story behind his death is not mentioned, and it is dangerous to assume that Romulus does or does not bear responsibility for this act.

13 Ov. *Met*. 14.806, "Romulus, you were making laws."

14 Verg. *Aen*. 1.292–3; see above, pp. 149–150. Robinson 2011:310–11 suggests that Ovid's aim here is to show the difference between Romulus ruling alone and the twins ruling together; this is emphasized by the murder of Tatius: "death seems to be the fate awaiting all those who attempt to share rule with the leader" (n51).

15 Stok 1991:185.

Ovid draws between gods and kingship is the inverse of Cicero's, a sentiment that is echoed by Romulus' immediate reward: apotheosis.[16] As readers, we know that Romulus' deification was achieved only at the cost of his two colleagues: first Remus, for only one twin will become a god (line 814), and then Tatius, whose death immediately precedes the announcement of apotheosis. With the death of Tatius, as in his account of Remus' death, Ovid emphasizes the desirability of individual rule.

The story of Tatius, brief as it is, gains significance in the context of the rivalry of Romulus and Remus examined above. In both cases, Romulus starts out sharing power: with Remus as leader over the shepherds, and with Tatius as leader of Rome. In both cases this experiment fails, and Romulus' co-rulers die. But these deaths, and the sole rule of Romulus, are beneficial for Rome. The death of Remus allows for the foundation of the city; that of Tatius leads to the expansion of the city under a single ruler. Moreover, it is the death of Tatius that truly unites the enlarged city by eliminating the possibility that the Sabines will break away from their Roman alliance.

Throughout Romulus' life story, possession of power is a crucial (and sometimes fatal) issue. In this sense, the deaths of Remus and Titus Tatius are clearly parallel, and it is surprising that this similarity is rarely noted by those studying the foundation story. Wiseman interpreted these deaths as akin to a mistake caused by the accumulation of legends, which must be erased by the elimination of the additional characters.[17] While this idea perhaps explains one of the legends, it is less likely that the same flaw would recur in two stories with an identical theme found in the life of the founder (not to mention the fact that the same theme and the same problem also appear in the foundation story of the Republic, as Wiseman was well aware; see note). Dyadic rivalry is not a mistake, but a key feature of Roman historical thought and myth-making.

Romulus is the monarch *par excellence* at Rome, the founder of the city and its government. The fact that he is twice depicted as failing to establish a system of shared power is significant for Romans' understanding of their own government and power structure. His inability to reign effectively with others for any lengthy period of time problematizes the interaction of collegiality and ambition in the Roman elite sphere. By the first century, the only period for

16 See Ov. *Met.* 14.807–28.

17 Wiseman 2008a:301, equation of Remus, Tatius, and Collatinus (on whom see below, pp. 190–205); see Wiseman 1995a for the idea that Remus' presence and death indicate the accumulation of myths and eventual pruning of them by later writers. Similarly, Dench 2005:253 calls Tatius "a second Remus, an uncomfortable *alter ego* who must be eliminated."

which we have evidence, Romulus' lack of cooperation with Tatius rejects the possibility that competition could benefit the state. Instead, it benefits from the elimination of such competition, even if that means the leadership of an individual.

Amulius and Numitor

Livy sets up a parallel between Romulus and Remus and their forefathers Amulius and Numitor when he refers to the desire of both twins and Amulius to rule as an *avitum malum*.[18] But the similarity between these two pairs of dyadic rivals goes beyond a simple verbal echo. Amulius and Numitor do not merely shape the destiny of their nephews; they are also constructed from their image. Numitor in particular seems to be a later addition to this legend; his role in this story is elaborated over the course of the first century. This is consistent with the development of the Romulus and Remus legend that I have traced in the previous chapters, and it is probable that they occurred in tandem.

By Livy's and Dionysius' day, Numitor has become a precursor to Romulus. Numitor's quarrel with Amulius foreshadows that of Romulus and Remus, and also reinforces it. By adding a generation of strife, first-century writers place increasing stress on the tension between ambition and collegiality: it ends in murder. This tension is repeatedly marked through the deaths of Amulius, Remus, and Titus Tatius. Assigning new conflict to the pre-Romulean generation adds a further dimension to the curse narrative presented by Horace; the cycle of violence started before the foundation and would continue into the future. This increasing bleakness fits well in an atmosphere of civil war.

The early versions of this story are not well-attested. Republican fragments present a varied picture. According to the Servian commentary on the *Aeneid*, both Ennius and Naevius recounted that Romulus and Remus were the grandsons of Aeneas.[19] If so, Numitor could not have been part of their stories, at least not in his later role of grandfather. Indeed, the numerous Greek accounts

18 Livy 1.6.4, "ancestral vice."

19 See Serv. *Aen.* 6.777 (*secundum Ennium. . . . Iliam fuisse filiam Aeneae. Quod si est, Aeneas avus est Romuli*, "according to Ennius, Ilia was the daughter of Aeneas; if so, Aeneas is the grandfather of Romulus"), Serv. auct. *Aen.* 1.273 (*Naevius et Ennius Aeneae ex filia nepotem Romulum conditorem urbis tradunt*, "Naevius and Ennius say that Romulus, the founder of the city, was the grandson of Aeneas via his daughter"); on the absence of Numitor in Naevius and other changes from the 'vulgate' story, see Manuwald 2001:150–4.

of the foundation and Aeneas stories do not mention him.[20] In this version, there does not seem to be a struggle for the throne until the twins'.

This silence in the second-century accounts reinforces the diminished emphasis on strife between Romulus and Remus that I argued for in chapter two. The twins' rivalry is not an ancestral trait; it occurs in isolation. Without Numitor, the account of the twins' birth and exposure may have been similar to Herodotus' story of the exposure of Cyrus.[21] In Herodotus, Cyrus' grandfather Astyages has two mysterious dreams about his daughter, which the Persian magi interpret as threatening to his throne. In response, he marries her to a relatively minor noble and, when she bears a child, orders him exposed soon after birth. If we hypothesize that Amulius is a male relative of Ilia's, a similar plot could hold.[22] Amulius may have received a prophecy that the children of Ilia would overthrow him, and, as the result of this prophecy, first forced her into a life of chastity as a Vestal; then, when that did not work, ordered his servants to expose the children. Strife between Amulius and a male relation of Ilia is not necessary for such a plot.

The possible version outlined above is the same as the Amulius story that appears in Cicero's *de Re Publica*.[23] Although the appearance of such a story in Cicero does not guarantee its existence in Ennius or Naevius, it does provide evidence that this story *could* be presented in such a way: that is, that the twins' birth and exposure could be narrated without also narrating a story of violence between Amulius and Numitor. The Ciceronian evidence is supported by the testimony of Servius.[24] This explicit reference makes the absence of Numitor in Ennius relatively straightforward. It seems probable that Naevius and Ennius offered broadly similar accounts, but that does not necessarily mean that they were characteristic of the tale as it was told in the second century; it has been argued that Numitor was present in Fabius Pictor's account of Roman history.

20 See Cornell 1975 with full ancient source citation.

21 Hdt. 1.107–24; esp. 107–8.

22 The OGR cites several potential supports for this scenario. One is the version of 'Valerius' (Antias?) at 19.4, in which a dream is Amulius' excuse for making Rhea a Vestal; this fragment is discussed further below, p. 186. A writer whose identity is hard to untangle, but who may be Piso, Varro, or Cassius Hemina (9.3) says that Aeneas had two sons, which may be our first sign of Amulius (the other is Iulus). On the authorship of this fragment, see Forsythe 1994:91–102. Licinius Macer is said to have claimed (19.5) that Amulius himself raped Rhea; this may also relate to a Cyrus-like tale, as Astyages' dreams are fairly sexualized. See *FRHist* III.418–20 (on Macer, 27 F1 = 1 Chassignet = 1 B-W = 1 Walt) for this fragment and related discussion.

23 Cic. DRP 2.4; at this point the text is complete.

24 And that of the OGR (see above, n. 22).

But this attribution is questionable, and we cannot be certain that Numitor appeared in the Romulus and Remus story before the first century.

Our knowledge of the Fabian version of the origins comes largely from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Editions of the fragments going back to Peter print four chapters of Dionysius' history as a Fabian fragment because it is introduced as coming from Fabius, among a number of other writers, and ends with a reference to τοῖς περὶ Φάβιον.[25] Yet, as Poucet has rightly pointed out, Dionysius does not preserve the exact narrative of the Roman annalist: he cites Fabius as one of a list of authors whose version he follows, and provides a lengthy narrative that is unlikely to stem directly from Fabius Pictor.[26] As Poucet rightly argued, Dionysius' account gives us Fabius Pictor's account at second hand in the best case. Moreover, it is dangerous to use Dionysius as a guarantor of what Fabius Pictor actually said, particularly since Dionysius provides a list of authorities.[27] Poucet thus considered Dionysius' account "la forme ultime qu'avait prise a la fin de la République la version traditionnelle du récit des enfances,"[28] albeit one that includes earlier material.[29] Part of the problem in isolating a second-century perspective is that we simply do not know which is the earlier and which is the later material.

There have been several attempts to tease out the Fabian narrative. Gerald Verbrugghe argued that Plutarch preserves the actual Fabian account, while Dionysius' account has been contaminated by Tubero.[30] That Dionysius

---

25 See Fabius Pictor (*FRHist* 1 F4a-b = 7 Chassignet = 7 B-W = 5 P = 4 Jacoby; the sources are DH 1.79.4–83.3 and Plut. *Rom.* 3.1–8.9. The quote is from DH 1.83.3, "a Fabian tradition." The source tradition is discussed by Beck-Walter 2001 [2005]:89–90; see also *FRHist ad* 1F7 (III.24) on the significance of the phrase. Plutarch's account is largely the same as Dionysius' here; for his potential sources, see Ampolo and Manfredini 1988:xlix–lv and 276–92. Also compare Cicero's evidence (above, n. 23).

26 Poucet 1976:207, "Denys d'Halicarnasse se referé ici a Fabius Pictor, simplement comme au chef de file de toute une tradition fort longue."

27 See Poucet 1976:214–15, "quand un texte assez long est rapporte simplement avec la garantie d'un auteur anterieur, la garantie ne porte que sur le contenu general, global du texte et n'interdit pas l'insertion d'elements nouveaux. C'est doublement vrai lorsqu'un texte étendu est rapporte a une serie d'auteurs." This is similarly stressed by Beck-Walter 2005:89 and Chassignet 1996:lxvii and lxviii. On a similar topic, see also Cameron 2004.

28 Poucet 1976:216.

29 See e.g. Poucet 1976:208n27.

30 Verbrugghe 1981:237–8; *contra* Peter, whose commentary on this fragment considers Plutarch's account largely non-Fabian. Marchetti 2002: 82–6 is too extreme in his argument for a late tradition. Chassignet 1996:29 and Beck-Walter 2001 [2005] *ad loc.* are noncommittal; Bispham and Cornell (*FRHist ad loc.*) are cautiously optimistic that we have a largely Fabian account (see *FRHist* III.16–20).

included material from a tradition later than Fabius in his account of Romulus and Remus is not in doubt; however, Plutarch too worked with many sources and is subject to Poucet's cautions. A version of Poucet's argument is preferable. Dionysius' concern with accurate chronology implies that Fabius Pictor's account included the Alban Kings; if it had not, it is probable that Dionysius would have argued against this lack chronological precision.[31] The inclusion of the Alban king list, however, does not require the inclusion of Numitor.[32]

It is likely that the introduction of Numitor came from this later tradition. Dionysius introduces Numitor long before he cites Fabius Pictor.[33] In fact, the strife between Numitor and Amulius appears five chapters before the Fabian fragment.[34] This story, similar to the version known from Livy, is not attributed to any source; rather, Dionysius tells of the birth of the twins and says only that most agree.[35] It is only after this, when Dionysius introduces the rescue of the twins, that Fabius and other historians are introduced.[36] Moreover, even in the chapters that have been traditionally attributed to Fabius, Dionysius' citation of sources is sloppy: although the entire section that follows is attributed to a Fabian tradition (1.79.4, 1.83.3), Fabius himself is cited only at its beginning and end. In the middle, however, Dionysius introduces new source material when he contrasts Tubero's version of the Lupercalia with Fabius' (1.80.3).[37] Dionysius never indicates when Tubero's unique information ends; he also never attributes anything explicitly to Fabius alone, making it difficult to know what part of this long narrative was in Fabius himself. In Dionysius, then, the source of Amulius and Numitor's enmity is left unclear.

There was no need for the earlier tradition to include the tension between Numitor and Amulius. The important parts of Numitor's role, such as the

---

31 As he does with the tangled chronology of the Tarquins (see DH 4.6.1–7.5 and 4.30.2–3).

32 The evidence of the Tauromenion dipinto, often cited as confirmation (see e.g. Dillery 2002), is equivocal: Fabius discussed Aeneas's arrival and πολὶ ὕστε[ρον] Romulus and Remus (*SEG* 26.1123 fr. IIIa10; FP *FRHist* 1 T7 = 1 B-W = 1 Chassignet).

33 DH 1.71.4 vs. 1.79.4.

34 DH 1.76.1.

35 DH 1.79.1, Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν συγγραφέων τὰ αὐτὰ ἢ μικρὸν παραλλάττοντες, "up to this point, most writers tell the same or only a slightly different story."

36 DH 1.79.4, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίας γενομένων Κόιντος μὲν Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ λεγόμενος, ᾧ Λεύκιός τε Κίγκιος καὶ Κάτων Πόρκιος καὶ Πείσων Καλπούρνιος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οἱ πλείους ἠκολούθησαν, γέγραφε ("Quintus Fabius Pictor, whom Lucius Cincius and Porcius Cato and Calpurnius Piso and the majority of other writers follow, writes thus about the children born to Ilia").

37 For the differences between Fabius et al. and Tubero, see above, pp. 93–95.

revelation of the twins' identity, can be attributed to others; for example, in Dionysius' account, Faustulus bears part of this responsibility.[38] Moreover, we have seen that the story can be told without these intervening generations, even in Rome's most famous epic. The only evidence for Numitor's appearance in the earliest Roman traditions is Dionysius' citation of Fabius Pictor. Because this citation does not make Fabius' contribution clear, it is a fragile claim.

To counter this ambiguous evidence, we have fairly secure testimony that neither Ennius nor Naevius included Numitor in their accounts of the twins' birth. Numitor as the enemy of Amulius could then be a later expansion of the legend, with a role intended to reinforce the strife of the founding family.

If the Fabian evidence is set aside, Numitor's first surviving appearance in the Roman historians would be in the Sullan-era Licinius Macer.[39] We have already encountered Macer's apparently heterodox account of the death of Remus in a brawl. His account of Amulius and Numitor was allegedly also quite different from other versions.[40] Two fragments of Macer refer to Numitor; only one relates a narrative. The first, less relevant fragment is also transmitted by Dionysius, who says only that according to Macer the deaths of Amulius and Numitor marked the end of the Alban royal family.[41] Because there is no indication of when these deaths occurred, this fragment does not offer much help in reconstructing Macer's narrative. The second fragment is more helpful, and perhaps fleshes out the more rationalizing suggestion in Livy's account of Rhea's impregnation.[42] This citation of Macer comes from the OGR, and thus its authenticity cannot be ascertained; however, it is worth examining briefly.

---

38 DH 1.80.3–4.

39 Macer (*FRHist* 27 F1 and 15 = 1 and 7 Chassignet = 1 and 7 B-W = 1 and 7 Walt; fr. 7 = 10 P).

40 Oakley (*FRHist* I.331) cautions that "original information provided by Macer is almost always unreliable." This seems slightly extreme given the limited information we have about earlier historiography. See also p. 419 on the fragment.

41 Macer (*FRHist* 27 F15 = 7 Chassignet = 7 B-W = 7 Walt = 10 P); DH 5.74.4. The text reads Λικίννιος δὲ παρ᾽ Ἀλβανῶν οἴεται τὸν δικτάτορα Ῥωμαίους εἰληφέναι, τούτους λέγων πρώτους μετὰ τὸν Ἀμολίου καὶ Νεμέτορος θάνατον ἐκλιπούσης τῆς βασιλικῆς συγγενείας ἐνιαυσίους ἄρχοντας ἀποδεῖξαι τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐξουσίαν τοῖς βασιλεῦσι, καλεῖν δ᾽ αὐτοὺς δικτάτορας ("Licinius [Macer] thinks that the Romans took over the dictatorship from the Albans, saying that those men first established annual magistracies after the deaths of Amulius and Numitor marked the end of the royal family. These magistrates had the same power as the kings, and they were called dictators").

42 See Livy 1.4.2.

> Amulium patruum Rheae sacerdotis amore eius captum nubilo caelo obscuroque aere, cum primum illucescere coepisset, in usum sacrorum aquam petenti insidiatum in luco Martis compressisse eam.[43]

The subsequent strife between Amulius and Numitor is attributed to Amulius' incestuous rape of his niece. Although this does establish hostility between Amulius and Numitor, this hostility is emotionally, not politically, motivated. We do not know what the relations were between Amulius and Numitor before this event, although the OGR claims that the two had peacefully divided their kingdom, perhaps indicating cooperative behavior.[44] Thus, while this narrative may indicate the wide range of options for retelling this tale, it is not full enough to determine whether Amulius and Numitor were dyadic rivals. From the account that survives, it seems more likely that, in the early period, they were not.

A similar point can be made about the next appearance of Numitor, in Valerius Antias via the OGR.[45] This fragment does not indicate political rivalry between the brothers at all.[46] In the OGR story, Numitor willingly abdicates: *Numitor <cum> privatum otium cum facultatibus regno praetulisset, Amulius regnum obtinuit.*[47] In these two OGR narratives, then, we see a substantial difference from the Livian tale. Enmity between Amulius and Numitor, when it is present, is not due to the desire of either to rule; instead, they peacefully divide the kingdom (in the case of Antias) or their hostility is apolitical (Macer). The Antian account of initial cooperation is supported by the first-century CE geographer Strabo.[48] Yet in Strabo, as in Livy, Amulius and Numitor also prefigure Romulus and Remus.

---

43 Macer (*FRHist* 27 F1 = 1 Chassignet = 1 B-W = 1 Walt); OGR 19.5, "Amulius, the uncle of the priestess Rhea, was captivated with love for her. When the sky was cloudy and dark, as dawn was first brightening, he ambushed and raped her as she was fetching water for the sacred rites in the grove of Mars."

44 OGR 19.3.

45 Antias (*FRHist* 25 F2 = 2 Chassignet = 2 B-W); OGR 19.4. The date of Valerius Antias is debated, but falls sometime in the first half of the first century BCE; see Wiseman 1979a:117–21 for an influential reassment. Rich (*FRHist* 1.295–6) offers a full discussion and suggests a date of c. 80–60 BCE.

46 Amulius does try to kill the twins and succeeds in killing Numitor's son; see Antias (*FRHist* 25 F1 = 1 Chassignet = 1 B-W); OGR 19.4. But it is problematic to assume that this entailed rivalry with Numitor; Amulius may simply have been a tyrant.

47 OGR 19.3, "since Numitor preferred peace and quiet to kingship, Amulius got the throne." This is not explicitly attibuted to Antias, however, and can only be used with caution.

48 Str. 5.3.2.

The mid-first century BCE historian Aelius Tubero, in contrast, relates essentially the Livian story.[49] Although this fragment also comes from Dionysius, it is introduced much more directly than the disputed Pictor fragment. Tubero may indeed have been Dionysius' source for his Greek materials;[50] he has long been considered Livy's source for the capture of Remus.[51] The fragment has been discussed above in the contexts of both the Lupercalia and Fabius Pictor; however, it is worth adding that this is the most secure attribution of the strife narrative before Livy, and that it comes only a generation earlier.

Taken together, the fragments I have examined indicate that a variety of options existed in the second and early first centuries; emphasis on familial strife perhaps developed only around the middle of the first century. This is to some degree an argument from silence, as it must be;[52] still, it seems safe to conclude that (1) the earlier accounts need not have included Numitor, but (2) the introduction of Numitor had occurred by the Sullan period; nonetheless, (3) his poor relationship with Amulius may be post-Caesarian. It is in this fairly recent context that we must place the account of Livy.

As he did in the case of Romulus and Remus, Livy attributes the strife between Numitor and Amulius to their desire for political control. The general tradition says that when their father Procas died, he left the kingdom to Numitor and the money to Amulius. Amulius was not satisfied with this situation and ousted his brother from the throne. In the coup, Amulius also killed Numitor's only son and cloistered his daughter, Rhea Silvia, with the Vestals, hoping to put an end to Numitor's family line. As we saw above, this attempt failed; Rhea became pregnant and delivered the twins Romulus and Remus, whom Amulius ordered to be exposed. They survived, however, and were raised as shepherds. As young men, the twins learned the truth of their birth, and with the aid of their shepherd friends attacked Amulius and killed him, returning power to their grandfather Numitor. The remainder of Numitor's

---

49 Tubero (*FRHist* 38 F3 = 4 Chassignet = 4 B-W = 3 P); DH 1.80.1–3. Tubero was a friend of Cicero's; see e.g. *Lig.* 1; *FRHist* 1.361–7.

50 See Richardson 2011.

51 See e.g. Winter 1910:197–9; Forsythe 1999:94. The story as it appears in Dionysius and Livy (discussed above, pp. 93–96) is not very similar.

52 Amulius appears only rarely outside of these fragments (prose history: Vennonius *FRHist* 13 F1 = 1 Chassignet, and Antias *FRHist* 25 F1= 1 Chassignet = 1 B-W; verse: Enn. *Ann.* 61 Sk, *rex Albai Longai*, and Naev. *Bell. Pun.* fr. 26 Strz). In none of these cases does he appear with Numitor or an unnamed companion.

reign is left rather hazy by the tradition; he stays in Alba Longa, while the twins set out to found Rome, the focus of our historical accounts.

Although Romulus and Remus are usually credited with Amulius' death, the lengthier accounts make it clear that they are working in tandem with Numitor.[53] In Dionysius and Diodorus, they follow his explicit plans and leadership:

> ὁ δὲ τοῖς παισὶ δηλώσας τὸν κατειληφότα κίνδυνον αὐτοὺς καὶ παρακελευσάμενος ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γενέσθαι παρῆν ἄγων ὡπλισμένους ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια τῶν τε ἄλλων πελατῶν καὶ ἑταίρων καὶ θεραπείας πιστῆς χεῖρα οὐκ ὀλίγην. ἧκον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν συνελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπόντες τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔχοντες ὑπὸ ταῖς περιβολαῖς ξίφη κεκρυμμένα, στῖφος καρτερόν. βιασάμενοι δὲ τὴν εἴσοδον ἀθρόᾳ ὁρμῇ πάντες οὐ πολλοῖς ὁπλίταις φρουρουμένην ἀποσφάττουσιν εὐπετῶς Ἀμόλιον καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἄκραν καταλαμβάνονται.[54]

Here Numitor acts as an instigator, clarifying the danger and spurring the twins to rebel. Ultimately, though, the responsibility is shared: βιασάμενοι ... πάντες. All of the forces on the twins' side contribute to Amulius' death. In Diodorus Siculus, similarly, Numitor is the mastermind behind the coup (ἐπεβούλευσε κατὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδελφοῦ περὶ ἀναιρέσεως).[55] Romulus and Remus physically carry out the murder, but it is Numitor's idea.

---

53 Romulus and Remus seem to act alone in Str. 5.3.2, ἀνδρωθέντας δ' ἐπιθέσθαι τῷ Ἀμολλίῳ καὶ τοῖς παισί· καταλυθέντων δ' ἐκείνων καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰς τὸν Νουμίτορα περιστάσης ("when the twins grew up, they attacked Amulius and his sons and killed them, and restored the throne to Numitor"), and perhaps also in Justin 43.2.1, *Occiso Amulio regnum Numitori restituitur* ("when Amulius was dead, the kingdom was restored to Numitor"). But the twins' apparently independent activity may well be due to the brevity of these versions. As we will see in the case of Livy (below, p. 189), Numitor can take credit for Romulus and Remus' deeds.

54 DH 1.83.3, "Numitor revealed the looming danger to his grandchildren and urged them to be brave men. He then came to the palace, leading no small band of armed men comprising his neighbors, companions, and faithful servants. Men from the country who had come to the city were there as well, leaving the marketplace with swords hidden beneath their clothing. This was a strong group. They all forced the entrance open by a massed onslaught, since it was guarded by only a few men, and easily killed Amulius. After this they took the citadel." The full story begins at 1.81.1. A variant of the story occurs at 1.84.8, also with Numitor in command.

55 DS 8.3; the full quote reads Ὅτι Νεμέτωρ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδελφοῦ στερηθεὶς τῆς βασιλείας, ὃς Ἀμόλιος ἐκαλεῖτο, ἐβασίλευσε δὲ Ἀλβανῶν, τοὺς ἰδίους υἱωνοὺς παρ' ἐλπίδας ἀναγνωρίσας Ῥέμον καὶ Ῥωμύλον, ἐπεβούλευσε κατὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδελφοῦ περὶ ἀναιρέσεως. ὃ καὶ γέγονε· μεταπεμψάμενοι γὰρ τοὺς νομεῖς ὥρμησαν ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ ἐντὸς τῶν θυρῶν εἰσεβιάσαντο

Livy makes Numitor's involvement even more obvious. In addition to the desire for kingship causing a rift between Amulius and Numitor, the latter claims responsibility for the twins' actions once the deed has been done: *Numitor … postquam iuvenes perpetrata caede pergere ad se gratulantes vidit, extemplo advocato concilio scelera in se fratris … caedem deinceps tyranni seque eius auctorem ostendit*.[56] As a result, Numitor was (at least indirectly) the cause of his brother's death, much as Romulus bore the blame for Remus' end. These stories are closely linked, both thematically and in terms of the *avitum malum* that haunts the founding family of Rome.

The inherited problem recalls Horace's seventh *Epode*, in which Remus' death continues to haunt the Romans of the present day. Taking this theme a step further back into the past, Livy can show that fraternal strife is not only a problem for contemporary Romans because of Romulus and Remus, but was also a problem for Romulus and Remus due to their grandfather and great-uncle. The inclusion of ancestral guilt places the twins on the same plane as Livy's contemporaries: rather than the originators of evil, Romulus and Remus are now both the victims and the perpetuators of it. Similar charges could be made against Romans of the civil war era. Unlike Horace's Remus, the Romans of Livy's day (or slightly before) are not completely innocent victims. Instead, they instigate further violence by continuing along the same paths that got them into trouble.[57] This story of cyclical guilt is far more powerful than the story of Romulus and Remus alone.

Livy further emphasizes the link between the ancestral power struggle and the foundation by repeating the phrase *regni cupido* at various points throughout his early history: Romulus and Remus, the senators after Romulus' death,

---

καὶ τοὺς ὑφισταμένους ἀνῄρουν, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀμόλιον ("Numitor was deprived of the kingship by his own brother, whose name was Amulius and who ruled the Albans. When he recognized his grandsons Remus and Romulus, which Amulius had not expected, he plotted death against his brother. And this occurred; for sending for the shepherds, they attacked the palace. They forced the doors and killed those who opposed them, and finally slew even Amulius himself").

56 Livy 1.6.1, "After the murder had been carried out and he saw the young men coming to congratulate him. Numitor at once called together his council and made clear his brother's crimes against him … and finally the murder of the tyrant and his own responsibility for it."

57 Possibly the clearest example of this is Cicero's misjudgment of Octavian; the powers that Cicero urged the senate to grant Caesar's heir replicated the previous exceptional honors allotted to Caesar and Pompey.

Publicola, and the *affectatores regni* share this desire.[58] This repeated usage reiterates that the central concern of these tales is the tenure of political power in Rome. It also indicates that Livy sees the desire for power as extending beyond the foundation in both directions. The continuity of this desire to rule is a marker of the times: Amulius and Numitor struggle with it, and their contest for power is repeated two generations later by Romulus and Remus. In the 30s, it is easy to see how this repetition of strife could be related to the conflicts between first Caesar and Pompey and then Octavian and Antony. This bleaker version of the endlessness of conflict seems confined to Livy, or perhaps to his generation; there is no trace of it in Dionysius.

In sum, the story of Numitor and Amulius is similar in plot to that of Romulus and Remus and was probably modeled on the twins' legend. In its earlier stages, Amulius did not have a brother and does not seem to have been at odds with anyone; his reasons for exposing the twins are unclear, but it is possible that he was motivated by an unfavorable prophecy. Such a prophecy may have foretold his death or usurpation at the hands of Romulus and Remus, and in the event came true. Numitor, when he appears, plays a smaller role in the story. His involvement subtly changes the narrative by the late Republic. Although Romulus and Remus physically carry out Amulius' murder, Numitor takes responsibility for this act in our fully surviving sources.

Brutus the Liberator and Other Founders of the Republic

Brutus, the founder of the Roman Republic, is well-represented in the historical tradition. He is the subject of a late-second century *praetexta* by Accius, appears in fragments of Postumius Albinus and Calpurnius Piso,[59] and is discussed in detail by both Dionysius and Livy.[60] Unlike the other cases in which we can contrast an earlier Republican narrative with its late first-century variant, however, the story of Brutus is largely static across all of these accounts. The supposedly dumb scion of his noble family, he is spurred to action by the heroic death of Lucretia and spearheads the movement to expel the Tarquin rulers of Rome, a famously bloodless revolution. He later becomes the first

58 Romulus and Remus, Livy 1.6.4 (with reference back to Amulius and Numitor); the senators after Romulus' death, 1.71.1; Publicola, 2.7.9; for the three *affectatores regni*, see pp. 258–60 below and Neel forthcoming (with further bibliography).

59 Post. Alb. (*FRHist* 4 F2 = 4 Chassignet = 4 B-W = 2 Peter = *FrGrHist* 812 F3); Piso (*FRHist* 9 F20 = 21 Chassignet = 21 B-W = 19 P = 26 Forsythe).

60 DH 4.67–5.18; Livy 1.56–2.8. Further sources are given in *MRR* I.1–2.

consul of the city and dies heroically in battle against his Tarquin foes. As the founder of the Republic, he ought to represent its values; the congruence of his story at first seems to show agreement in how to present his tale.

Yet Brutus, like Romulus, is an ambiguous character. His deeds can be manipulated to fit various authorial ends, as in the case of the city's foundation. Like the story of Romulus, the central concern of the story of Brutus is political power; this has been discussed at length in previous scholarship.[61] I argue, however, that it is Brutus' dyadic rivalry with Collatinus that fully illustrates this concern. The expulsion of the Tarquins is only half the story, and leaves a power vacuum in the city. How this vacuum is filled yields far more interesting fruit: Brutus' adherence to Republican ideals is not nearly as evident in his full story as it seems from isolated episodes.

Indeed, Brutus and Collatinus, the first two consuls of the Republic, fail to share power. The presence of dyadic rivalry in this story is more notable because the hero, Brutus, is not only related to the Roman kings, but also is ambitious enough to overthrow them before pushing his colleague out of office. Brutus thus eliminates his potential rivals, and provides another example of the problematic relationship between collegiality and ambition.

Brutus' full story stretches back to the previous generation. He is a Tarquin, a fact that is not emphasized in Livy.[62] When his male relatives are killed by Tarquinius Superbus, Brutus feigns stupidity in an attempt to survive. This works, and he becomes a companion to the king's sons; when king Tarquin receives a frightening omen, Brutus is sent to Delphi along with two of the young Tarquins to seek advice.[63] He then disappears from view until the rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquin. At that point, Brutus is re-introduced into the narrative as a friend of Collatinus, Lucretia's husband, to lead the rebellion. The two become Rome's first consuls. Yet soon after the expulsion of the kings, Brutus forces Collatinus into exile, problematizing the message of shared power.

This development is hinted at from the beginning of the Brutus tale. In the account that Livy gives of the Delphic oracle, it is Brutus alone who is marked as the next to rule Rome: *imperium summum Romae habebit, qui vestrum*

61 See e.g. Ogilvie 1965:226–7; Gantz 1975; and Wiseman 2008a, all with bibliography; on the earlier part of the legend, see Smith 2007 (concerned only with Livy).

62 It is mentioned briefly at 1.56.7. For more details, see DH 4.68.1. See also Gantz 1975 and Mastrocinque 1988 (esp. chapter 8) on this 'plebeian' branch of the royal family, and its affinities with the foundation myth; Smith 2007 and Richardson 2011 for more historiographical explanations.

63 Livy 1.56.4–12; in DH 4.68.1–69.4, they seek the oracle's advice due to a plague.

primus, o iuvenes, osculum matri tulerit.[64] The oracle is given to two of the king's three sons (Titus and Arruns, rather than the arrant Sextus) as well as Brutus. The two Tarquins decide by lot who will be the first to kiss his mother, but it is Brutus who understands that he must kiss the earth. He does so and thus fulfills the prophecy.[65]

In this anecdote, the actions of the young Tarquins mirror those of Romulus and Remus a few generations earlier. When faced with a single kingdom for multiple brothers, they did not think of sharing power; instead, they instantly shut their absent brother Sextus out of the process entirely,[66] and between themselves left the matter in the hands of the gods. Their recourse to the lot recalls Romulus' and Remus' use of augury to determine the rightful ruler. To the Tarquins, then, only one man can rule, but the choice is made in fair competition. Brutus' actions likewise imply an individual taking on sole authority. He understands that the oracle promises political power and purposefully fulfills the prophecy. Thus it is clear that only Brutus will receive the supreme command of Rome. Wiseman has pointed out that it is already unusual to have the founder of the Republic understand and act upon an oracle relating to strong executive power.[67] I agree with this assessment, but it does not go

64 Livy 1.56.10, "Youths, whichever of you first kisses his mother will hold the highest command at Rome."

65 Ogilvie 1965:218 compares the earth/mother equation to Suet. *DJ* 7 (*quando mater, quam subiectam sibi uidisset, non alia esset quam terra, quae omnium parens haberetur*, "since the mother whom he saw subject to him was no other than Earth, the mother of all things") and says that the passages "can hardly be unconnected." If so, this may be further evidence for late Republican tinkering with legends; although Suetonius may simply be using Livy as a model, the association would have had little force in the second century CE, while in the late Republic comparing Caesar to the Liberator would have been an explicit political statement, contrasting with Brutus' own use of his ancestor. For the association of the Delphic oracle with foundation, see Dougherty 1993:181–5; the story of Brutus is similar to that of Battus, the founder of Cyrene, as told by Pindar (on which see Calame 2003). On Brutus the assassin's self-association with the founder of the Republic, see below, p. 203.

66 The wording of the oracle made this necessary in any case, as Sextus was not present and cannot be considered one of *vestrum*. Smith 2007:287–8 argues that the young Tarquins here mirror their father by keeping the omen secret, although Livy's account is so brief that it is difficult to prove that this was purposeful. Contrast Bunse 2001 on the censorship: use of *sortitio* is a sign of collegiality (p. 158). The connection of the lot with collegiality finds a parallel in Dionysius' version of this tale and the *OGR*'s account of Amulius and Numitor.

67 Wiseman 2008a:298.

far enough; indeed, the oracle promises Brutus *imperium* and foreshadows his failed attempt to rule with Collatinus.

In Dionysius' version of the story, the behavior of Titus and Arruns is much more complimentary. He claims that the two were determined to share power and made an agreement to kiss their mother at the same time, βουλόμενοι κοινῇ τὴν βασιλείαν κατασχεῖν.[68] This desire is the opposite of Livy's *avitum maulum* and *regni cupido*. In Livy, the desire to rule leads to familial strife; in Dionysius, the opportunity to secure power enhances the brothers' harmony. Their good intentions are emphasized by his use of diplomatic language (κοινῇ) to describe their future relationship. Anouk Delcourt has argued that Dionysius uses the various words relating to kingship very carefully; βασιλεία always has a positive semantic value.[69] Her analysis underlines the potential benefits to the joint rule of Titus and Arruns. Dionysius, then, relates a narrative in which two men who are willing to share power are ultimately ousted by a third; this third man, Brutus, as in Livy, is granted the potential to rule alone.

The difference from Livy may be due at least in part to the fact that in Dionysius, Sextus is the oldest of the brothers and heir to the throne; in Latin authors, he is the youngest.[70] This makes the younger sons' agreement to rule together more comprehensible—they are improving their chances at kingship—but does not lessen the significance of joint rule. This episode comes after Romulus' two attempts to share power; like the founder, Titus and Arruns are on the right path. Dionysius thus chose to depict the Tarquins as morally superior—to Romulus certainly, and perhaps to Brutus as well. The failure of Titus and Arruns to obtain the kingship does not alter the spirit of their initial agreement to share the throne. Instead, Dionysius presents his readers with a somewhat poignant example of the failure to rule jointly. Brutus, a usurper, manages to overthrow these potentially beneficent kings.

In contrast, Brutus' character, as depicted by Livy and Dionysius, is not a sterling example of Republican values. In Dionysius, the younger Tarquins are prepared to share the throne, while Brutus does not seem to be. Livy takes a less generous view of the younger Tarquins, but he nonetheless states clearly that Brutus alone is meant for rule. Despite Brutus' association with Republican ideology, his desire for power is made clear; otherwise, he would not have fulfilled the oracle. The first-century accounts indicate that Brutus is a Tarquin by birth who takes the first opportunity to snatch the throne from his cousins.

68 DH 4.69.4, "wishing to hold the kingship jointly."

69 Delcourt 2005:222–39. Although she discusses the reign of Tarquinius Superbus as a tyrant (pp. 337–54), she does not analyze this episode.

70 DH 4.65.2. Compare e.g. Livy 1.53.5 and Ov. *F.* 2.691.

The combination of leadership and strife is a pattern familiar from the dyadic rivalry of Romulus and Remus and from Amulius and Numitor. Consequently, Brutus is just as susceptible to Livy's *avitum malum* as these earlier examples.

But when Brutus does gain control of the city, he initially chooses to share that power.[71] This action seems to contradict the oracle discussed above, which gave him sole power. Wiseman has argued, based on this narrative discrepancy, that the addition of Collatinus is a later element of the tradition; he thinks that this also explains the rapid elimination of Collatinus.[72] Wiseman also argued that the roles of Titus Tatius, Remus, and Collatinus are parallel: all are later additions to the foundation narrative, designed to account for the Republican tradition of dual magistrates.[73] This is unsatisfactory, for the same reasons that I have already argued in regard to Remus: Collatinus is an integral part of the story. Rather than being an afterthought, his presence in the story as a dyadic rival problematizes the issue of power at Rome. As we have seen, the founder of the city could not share power; with Brutus and Collatinus, we see that even the founder of the Republic has trouble reconciling the temptations of kingship with his new political system. By the late first century, Livy and Dionysius can use this failure to conceptualize the failure of the Republic as a political system.

Brutus and Collatinus, the first two consuls, are dyadic rivals. The election[74] of Brutus and Collatinus is understandable, since Brutus had begun the revolution, and it is Collatinus' wife who was the initial cause of it; Collatinus is therefore dependably anti-Tarquin. This choice is essential to keep in mind: Collatinus always rules by will of the people. Stephen Smith argued that this proves that the consuls are both successors to Romulus' attempts to share rule and successful.[75] Yet Collatinus is, after a brief period of co-rulership, expelled from the city. Livy's explanation, that his Tarquinian name distressed the people, clashes with the earlier portion of his narrative. As we saw in book 1, it is Brutus who has a relationship with the Tarquins. Livy takes paints to note that

71 For the foundation of the Republic, see Livy 1.59.1–60.4; DH 4.70.1–84.5. Wiseman 2009a discusses the contemporary nuances of Livy's account; Richardson 2012:17–54 argues for the significance of family names in the perpetuation of legends. A number of works focus on the rape of Lucretia (e.g., Kraus 1991; Stem 2007), but this is not my concern here.

72 Wiseman 2008a:298–300.

73 *Ibid.* This notion is in essence based on Mommsen 1881:9–12.

74 Livy 1.60.4; DH 4.76.1 and 4.84.5 has them selected by the family and friends of Lucretia and then ratified by the popular assembly. The story also appears in Cic. *Off*. 3.40; *Brut*. 53; and *DRP* 2.53, all of which are closer to Livy's version.

75 Smith 2007:291–3.

he was the companion of the kings' sons on important missions. Collatinus' relationship with the royal family is less clear.

James Richardson has recently argued that it is the stress on the Tarquin name that matters here; as a 'Tarquin' himself in a position of power, Collatinus rouses fear in the populace that he will act like a Tarquin (that is, tyrannically).[76] Brutus, although a Tarquin by birth, is a scion of the Iunii. This is one of the less convincing examples from Richardson's provocative book. Although the expelled Tarquin had been called a tyrant and proud, this was not the characterization of the entire Tarquin family at Rome, but only two of its last members. We have seen that Dionysius knew a tradition where two of his sons were less tyrannical; the elder Tarquin was not considered a tyrant, nor was Superbus' brother—murdered, like Remus, in the quest for kingship. And although Collatinus is exiled because of his name, only Brutus refers to him as 'Tarquin'; Livy himself consistently calls him by his cognomen.[77] Although this is doubtless to differentiate Collatinus from Sextus Tarquin, it remains the case that little stress is placed on Collatinus' relationship with the rulers. This is in contrast to the detailed account of Brutus' family ties.

As Timothy Gantz has pointed out, Brutus himself is much more closely related to the Superbi than Collatinus is.[78] Livy must have been aware of Brutus' genealogy, as he does include the fact that Superbus is Brutus' uncle in his account of the oracle.[79] By eliminating Collatinus so soon after his election, Livy casts doubt upon Brutus' motives: in his narrative, Collatinus is dismissed almost as soon as he is elected.[80] A similar distrust may be apparent in his account of the Tarquins' conspiracy, discussed further below.

Livy is aware that the expulsion of Collatinus is harsh.[81] He puts the blame not on Brutus alone, though, but on Brutus via the Roman people. Collatinus' name bothers the populace: *regium genus, regium nomen non solum in civitate*

---

76 Richardson 2012:46–7.

77 E.g., Livy 1.58.1–2; 2.2.3. An exception is at 1.60.3, where Livy announces the election of the consuls; as eponymous magistrates, both Brutus and Collatinus have their full names recorded.

78 Gantz 1975:547–8, with a helpful stemma on p. 551.

79 See Livy 1.56.7, *comes iis additus L. Iunius Brutus Tarquinia sorore regis natus*, "with them [Titus and Arruns] as a companion came L. Junius Brutus, the son of Tarquinia, who was sister of the king." This episode was discussed above, pp. 191–193.

80 Livy 2.2.3–10.

81 See Livy 2.2.2, *Ac nescio an nimium undique eam minimisque rebus muniendo modum excesserint* ("And perhaps they went a little too far in guarding it [freedom], even in very small matters").

sed etiam in imperio esse; id officere, id obstare libertati.[82] This aspect of the story goes back at least to the Gracchan-era annalist Piso, in which Collatinus is expelled *quia Tarquinio nomine esset.*[83] Gary Forsythe avers that that "the Roman people's unease with the *nomen Tarquinium* was a dominant element in the historiographical tradition," including as evidence Piso, Cicero, and Livy.[84] But his suggestion elides the differences in these author's accounts. In Piso, the focus on the "Tarquin" element of Collatinus' name emphasizes the reason behind his coming exile. This strengthens Brutus' call for his colleague's removal and makes the threat of a Tarquin much clearer. In Livy, the focus is solely on kingship and command. Brutus' remarks before the people calling for Collatinus' removal do not mention the name 'Tarquin' at all; it must be inferred from the repeated references to kings and his subsequent request. The need to make this inference, together with Brutus' own relationship to the royal family, detracts from the justice of his cry for exile: it is not clear that Collatinus' name requires his removal.

Collatinus feels threatened; he worries that even if he abdicates, he will be subject to further harassment.[85] This is reminiscent of the threats of prosecution faced by many powerful men in the Republic, such as Tiberius Gracchus, Cicero, or Caesar.[86] For the case of Brutus, the latter is a more relevant example. Suetonius reports that Caesar feared indictment by Cato before he crossed the Rubicon, and Caesar himself apparently reported the same.[87] Brutus, then, is perhaps threatening a new civil war. As in the case of Remus' death, it is not necessary to postulate a specific historical parallel. Livy is summarizing an atmosphere of distrust and a lack of collegiality. This dangerous situation is less about the Tarquin name than about tyrannical power: Brutus as the first consul is spearheading the expulsion of an innocent citizen.

---

82 Livy 2.2.6, "the king's family, the king's name was not only in the city but even in command of it. This opposed and hindered liberty." Cf. Cic. *DRP* 2.53–4.

83 Piso (*FRHist* 9 F20 = 21 Chassignet = 21 B-W = 19 P = 26 Forsythe), "because he was of the Tarquin name." This fragment originates from Gellius and is cited for grammatical interest, but may suffer from an early copyist's error; see Pobjoy (*FRHist* III.204–5).

84 Forsythe 1994:247.

85 Livy 2.2.10, *timens consul ne postmodum privato sibi eadem illa cum bonorum amissione additaque alia insuper ignominia acciderent, abdicavit se consulatu* ("afraid that, once he was no longer consul, his property would be seized and he would suffer other, additional dishonors as a private citizen, [he] abdicated his consulship").

86 See e.g. *CAH*² vol. 9, chapter 11 [Wiseman]; Mackay 2004:151.

87 Suet. *DJ* 30.3–4, citing Caesar's contemporary Pollio. On the episode, see e.g. Gruen 1974:494–7, Stanton 2003.

For Dionysius, Collatinus is the more sympathetic character in this story. While Livy only hints at Brutus' potentially malicious reasons for eliminating his co-ruler, Dionysius states them outright.[88] This difference in degree is similar to that seen in Livy's and Dionysius' differing accounts of the death of Remus. But Dionysius' open hostility to the founder of the Republic is unexpected. As we saw in his account of the death of Remus, he supported a fairly positive depiction of Romulus; because Romulus and Brutus are both founders, we would expect a similarly positive depiction of Brutus. Instead, Dionysius states that Collatinus was in the right and Brutus in the wrong. The Republic then starts off on the wrong foot, with a crime, and its very first leader is singled out for injustice. This attitude is particularly notable coming from Dionysius, whose opinion of early Roman history is generally laudatory.

In Dionysius' account, the conflict between Brutus and Collatinus stretches out over a longer period of time. After the Tarquins are expelled, they send an embassy to Rome. Among their other activities, the ambassadors ask if the Tarquins may retain their moveable property. The two consuls disagree on whether this should be allowed. Brutus thinks not, while Collatinus points out that keeping the Tarquins' property makes the Romans look greedy and provides the former monarchs with an adequate *casus belli*. Although Brutus' advice is rightly cautious, Dionysius himself is in sympathy with Collatinus, as we learn a few sentences later: συμφορώτερα μὲν ὁ Βροῦτος ἐδόκει λέγειν, δικαιότερα δ' ὁ Κολλατῖνος παρῄνει.[89] Given Dionysius' explicit statements elsewhere that history ought to be didactic, this statement in the authorial voice is an important guide to what the reader ought to believe.[90] The decision of the Roman people, who ultimately allow the Tarquins to retain their possessions, reaffirms that Collatinus' advice is better. This offers the first indication that, of the two consuls, Brutus is the less moral; he even seems avaricious.

Up to this point, the narratives of Dionysius and Livy run, for the most part, in parallel. The main difference lies in the role of Collatinus, who is present in Dionysius' version but has already been exiled in Livy's. This difference leads to some further structural changes which make Livy's narrative center closely around the person of Brutus. The differences between the two historians are more marked in the next major episode of the Brutus story, the conspiracy to bring back the Tarquins. Whereas in Dionysius' account of the conspiracy the blame is shared between Brutus' family and Collatinus' family, in Livy only Brutus plays an important role. This is required by Livy's narrative, but

---

88 Livy 2.2.3–11; DH 5.3.3–11.3.

89 DH 5.6.1, "Brutus' words seemed more practical, but Collatinus' counsel was more just."

90 See DH *Ep. ad Pomp.* 3.

also changes the story to come: in Livy, the dramatic action between Brutus and Collatinus has already passed without much comment. In Dionysius, in contrast, the conflict between the two consuls provides the dramatic impetus both to Brutus' well-known execution of his children and to the expulsion of Collatinus. This in turn leads to a far different portrayal of Brutus than Livy's. In Livy, Brutus' actions against Collatinus are suspicious, but he ultimately proves his devotion to the Republic by the sacrifice of his children. Brutus could be blamed for this, but Livy stresses his commitment to the Republic.[91] In Dionysius, in contrast, even this commitment is in doubt: the Greek historian depicts Brutus as a tyrant.

Returning to Dionysius' narrative, the ambassadors prepared to return to the Tarquins. As they gathered up furniture and other belongings, they were also keeping an ear open for anti-Republican elements of the population. Eventually, a conspiracy formed with the aim of returning the kings to power. This conspiracy centered around six men: the Vitellii, Brutus' in-laws; the Aquilii, in Dionysius the nephews of Collatinus;[92] and the Junii, the two sons of the consul Brutus. When the plot is revealed, Brutus decides to punish all six of the conspirators as required by the law (that is, by execution), and immediately orders his sons scourged and beheaded; Collatinus seeks more moderate treatment for the remaining offenders.[93] When Brutus refuses to modify the sentence, Collatinus declares that the youths are free to go. Brutus is annoyed by this and says, Οὐκ ἐμοῦ γ' … ζῶντος, ὦ Κολλατῖνε, τοὺς προδότας τῆς πατρίδος ἰσχύσεις ἐξελέσθαι· ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ δώσεις δίκας ἃς προσῆκεν οὐκ εἰς μακράν.[94] These words are obviously a threat aimed at his fellow consul, and far from collegial. Brutus not only threatens to remove Collatinus from power, but also warns him of impending punishment if he continues to press for moderation. Moreover, this is not an isolated incident: Brutus claims that it will hold true for as long as he is alive, a gnomic threat that is reminiscent of Romulus' words about enemies and walls.

91 It is possible to be both Republican-minded and wrongheaded; see e.g. Cicero's remarks on Cato's staunch Republicanism (*Att.* 2.1.8)

92 DH 5.6.4; compare Livy 2.4.1, where the Aquilii's relationship with anyone in power is left unclear. This may indicate that the differences in Livy's narrative are his own changes meant to focus his narrative more closely on Brutus in the wake of Caesar's assassination; for M. Brutus' manipulation of this genealogy, see e.g. Richardson 2011.

93 Brutus' role as father, compared with Collatinus' as uncle, may play a role in this; see Bettini 1991:5–13 and 39–66.

94 DH 5.9.3, "Collatinus, so long as I live you will not have the power to free traitors to the country, but you yourself will pay the appropriate price—and soon."

Dionysius' negative depiction is not unique. Similar in spirit is Vergil's description of Brutus as *superbus*.[95] Here, the founder of the Republic ironically shares the primary quality of the king he has just exiled and whom his dead sons supported. The use of *superbus* throughout the *Aeneid* is linked to hostile characters, such as Cacus, Mezentius, or Turnus.[96] Although Servius in his commentary links the adjective back to the Tarquins, this has not been accepted by the majority of modern commentators.[97] Instead, Brutus' pride is linked to the expulsion of the kings and the foundation of the Republic. But this choice is troubling. *Superbia* is a key characteristic of tyrants.[98] By expelling the kings, Vergil shows that Brutus has become identified with their power, essentially the same theme that we see in the historical accounts of Brutus fulfilling the Delphic oracle.

In fact, Vergil obliquely hints at the tensions involved in dyadic rivalry when he ascribes the death of the young Junii to *amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*.[99] Brutus' patriotism is stressed here, but so is his ambition. *Cupido* is a negative term associated with tyrants, and an unfavorable description of the founder. The context of this description implies that these two qualities can be reconciled; just because they *can* be reconciled, however, does not mean that they always are. Jean-Luc Pomathios has suggested that Vergil's depiction of Brutus here is "une invitation dangereuse à l'affirmation individuelle en politique."[100] Like Dionysius, Vergil indicates that Brutus may not have the Republic's best interests at heart, but instead his own.

There are numerous contemporary echoes in the narrative of the Tarquin conspiracy. Ogilvie, along with many others, has noted the similarities to the Catilinarian affair.[101] The debate over the sons of Brutus in particular should have reminded Dionysius' Latin-speaking readers of the debate between Cato and Caesar made famous by Sallust, if not the strong position taken by Cicero.[102] While I would not want to suggest that Collatinus stands in for Caesar here, his quality of mercy is certainly reminiscent of Caesar's characteristic *clementia*.

---

95 Verg. *Aen.* 6.817–18.

96 Catalogued and analyzed in Lloyd 1972; see esp. pp. 127–9. See also Galinsky 2006:10–13; Arena 2012:244–5.

97 Servius *Aen.* 6.817–8; see Christenson 2002:49–50 for bibliography.

98 See Dunkle 1967; Lloyd 1972:127.

99 Verg. *Aen.* 6.823, "patriotism and the immense desire for praise."

100 Pomathios 1987:142.

101 Ogilvie 1965:242–3. See also Mastrocinque 1988:106 (claiming that the negative depiction of Brutus is post-Gracchan) and Baier 2003:238–9 (primarily concerned with Livy).

102 Cf. Sall. *BC* 50–1; 54.

This parallel may help explain why Dionysius' sympathies in this case lie with Collatinus, rather than with the expected hero, Brutus.[103]

In Dionysius' depiction, Brutus becomes more flawed as the account of the conspiracy approaches its climax. That Brutus threatens Collatinus is already uncollegial; what he does next is far worse. Calling together an assembly, he makes a speech in which he says that that Collatinus is οὐ μόνον τῇ φύσει Ταρκυνίων συγγενής, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ προαιρέσει, διαλλαγάς τε πράττων πρὸς αὐτους,[104] and that he himself κωλύειν αὐτὸν παρεσκεύασμαι πράττειν ἃ κατὰ νοῦν ἔχει πονηρὰ ὄντα.[105] According to Dionysius' own narrative, this is a lie: Collatinus has shown no indications of sympathy with the Tarquins. Instead, Dionysius has told us that Collatinus was trying to save his nephews from a traitor's execution. Twisting the words of one's opponent in this way is hardly democratic behavior; it is rather a characteristic of tyrants.[106] The lie further reinforces the association of Brutus with tyranny that we have seen in Dionysius and Vergil. Ironically, Brutus' actions are more tyrannical than Collatinus' and match his Tarquin birth and upbringing, even though he accuses Collatinus of regal sympathies.

Brutus further associates Collatinus with the Tarquins in two ways. First, he claims that Collatinus' desire to return the former kings' property was motivated by a desire to help the Tarquins in future conflicts with the city; then, he asserts that sparing the lives of the conspirators was tantamount to treason. He ends the speech by warning the Romans that they will δυεῖν θάτερον, ἢ Κολλατῖνον ἕξοντες ὕπατον ἢ Βροῦτον.[107] Such polarization is typical of dyadic rivals; in Dionysius' account of Romulus and Remus, for example, joint foundation was impossible: only one twin could found the city. Here, Dionysius tries to distance himself from this polarization by putting the choice in Brutus' speech, rather than in his own authorial voice. This indicates that the opposition is part of the plot, rather than Dionysius' own coloring, and provides an important reassertion of the key theme of dyadic rivalry: only one of the two can ultimately succeed in Rome.

---

103 On Brutus, see e.g. Richardson 2011:156–7.

104 DH 5.10.2, "not only related to the Tarquins by birth, but also by choice, working towards a reconciliation with them."

105 *Ibid.*, "was prepared to keep him from doing the evil deeds he had in mind."

106 Cf. Jaeger 2003:217n16, on Livy's representation of the Syracusan monarchs: "corruption of speech is an unmistakable marker of tyranny."

107 DH 5.10.7, "have either Collatinus as consul or Brutus, one or the other."

When Collatinus agrees to leave the city forever, Brutus' attitude again changes. He becomes quite friendly towards his colleague.[108] This reversal must be intentional: Brutus is happy to be rid of Collatinus. We see here again, then, that in Dionysius' account the founder of the Republic is an ambiguous character, who fluctuates between the collegiality expected of the first consul and tyrannical behavior.

This ambiguity is less marked in Livy's account. In Livy, the absence of Collatinus reduces the tension required to sustain a narrative about political power. Instead, Livy relates a much shorter tale about the best way to deal with a conspiracy.[109] No one questions Brutus' decision; although he is pitied, he is also respected for making the difficult choice between family and state. The fact that Livy's narrative has essentially the entire affair take place within Brutus' household only reiterates that he has the right, as the head of that household, to act as he pleases. Here, *paterfamilias* and *pater patriae* are truly identified: in acting ethically in regard to his family's crimes, he also acts ethically towards the state.[110] The identification diffuses the tension that sustains dyadic rivalry and that is present in Dionysius' account. Livy's praise for Brutus here largely conceals the uncomfortable story of his rise to power.

Andrew Feldherr has argued that Livy's version of this conspiracy reveals Brutus' essentially Republican values, rather than the Tarquins' tyrannical ones.[111] The Tarquins turn all affairs into family affairs, thus hiding and privatizing the workings of government. Brutus, in contrast, retains his civic role even against family.[112] Feldherr relates this difference to the rape of Lucretia, which Brutus, again, turns from a private affair into a public revolution by reconceptualizing Lucretia as a sacrifice.[113] These observations are valid, but Brutus shows his ambiguous nature here as well. Swearing an oath over a human victim is not typical Roman behavior; as Feldherr points out, it is reminiscent of Catiline.

---

108 See DH 5.12.2, παρεκάλει μήτ᾽αὐτῷ μήτε τῇ πατρίδι μνησικακεῖν, Brutus "urged him not to hold a grudge either against him or against his own country." The speech continues in a similarly collegial vein.

109 Livy 2.5.5–8.

110 For the significance of *pater patriae*, see e.g. Alföldi 1971 and 1985:279–83; for just murder, see e.g. Gaughan 2010. King 2006:221 connects the equation of *paterfamilias* and *pater patriae* with the loss of male autonomy. Stevenson 2000 offers an interesting analysis of the semantic distinction between *pater* and *parens* in these titles.

111 Feldherr 1997.

112 Feldherr 1997:144–6; this fits well with K. Welch (2005)'s argument for the association of *libertas* and the open sky.

113 Feldherr 1997:148–52.

A rebellious aristocrat who allegedly threatened to destroy the city provides a strange model for the founder of the Republic.[114] That oddity leaves an opening for a reader to consider Brutus' motives, the actions of his later namesake, and the type of state either one would attempt to establish. Reading Brutus as a straightforward *exemplum*, rather than as a character who learns to be a Republican citizen through some mistakes, robs the tale of much didactic value.

The other substantial narratives of Brutus and Collatinus come from Cicero. Both of these accounts are fairly brief, but they indicate an important parallelism between Romulus and Remus and Brutus and Collatinus. Moreover, Cicero's opinion of Brutus seems to change in the same way and at approximately the same time as his opinion of Romulus. In the *de Officiis*, this episode is brought up in a discussion of what is right versus what is expedient. Cicero sets it just before the section on Romulus and Remus, which I discussed in chapter three.[115] For Cicero, then, the link between these two narratives is even clearer than the link in the historians. Although Cicero's condemnation of Romulus in the *de Officiis* is quite strong, his praise of Brutus is more tentative. Cicero's goal in this section seems to be to justify Brutus' actions:

> Cum Collatino collegae Brutus imperium abrogabat, poterat videri facere id iniuste; fuerat enim in regibus expellendis socius Bruti consiliorum et adiutor. Cum autem consilium hoc principes cepissent, cognationem Superbi nomenque Tarquiniorum et memoriam regni esse tollendam, quod erat utile, patriae consulere, id erat ita honestum, ut etiam ipsi Collatino placere deberet. Itaque utilitas valuit propter honestatem, sine qua ne utilitas quidem esse potuisset.[116]

Cicero attributes the desire to eliminate the Tarquinian name to the *principes*, the leading men of state, rather than to the plebs as Livy does. In terms of Cicero's own political polarizations, this puts Brutus' actions on the side of

114 Feldherr 1997:151.

115 See above, pp. 79–81.

116 Cic. *Off.* 3.40, "When Brutus forced his colleague Collatinus out of office, this may have seemed an unjust act; for he had been a member of Brutus' council and helper in expelling the kings. But when the chief men in state had gotten the idea that the name of Superbus and the Tarquinii, the very memory of the kingship, had to be eliminated, then it was expedient to have regard for his country. This was so very honorable that Collatinus himself had to agree. And so expedience won out because of its justice, since without justice there could not have been expediency."

the *boni*, and therefore they are just. That the argument may be a fragile one is hinted at by the fact that Cicero begins his analysis by explaining that the forced exile of Collatinus might *seem* like an unjust act—the implication is that it would have been, had it been undertaken for different reasons. Only because Brutus' aim was for the greater good was this action laudable.

A similar argument may have been used by Cicero's contemporary Brutus to explain the assassination of Caesar. We know that this Brutus used his ancestor on his coinage to promote the cause of tyrannicide for the sake of the state.[117] Moreover, he was not the only one to manipulate the memory of his ancestor: graffiti was supposedly left on the statues of Brutus the Liberator and Caesar himself, calling for a new Brutus.[118] In 44, in other words, 'Brutus' conjured up the image of Caesar's assassin. Even though Cicero is here concerned not with the Liberator's expulsion of the kings, but rather his killing of his colleague, it seems likely that his apology for Brutus the Liberator is also a justification of his friend.

Elsewhere, Cicero does not comment on the morality of Brutus' actions. This is understandable in the *Brutus*, where only an offhand reference is made to Collatinus;[119] it is perhaps less so in the *de Re Publica.* Here, the Romans *Collatinum innocentem suspicione cognationis expulerunt et reliquos Tarquinios offensione nominis.*[120] Cicero's tone here is sympathetic to Collatinus. He is innocent and exiled, as Cicero had been himself. The banishment of Collatinus has nothing to do with his crimes, but only with his relatives; Cicero indicates that this is wrong. Although the reference is brief, Cicero's statement here is more similar to Dionysius' account than to Livy's, or even to his own later work. The possible reasons for the sharp distinction between Cicero's attitude in the *de Re Publica* and in the *de Officiis* has already been discussed; these are valid here as well. The similarity between Cicero's changing opinion of Brutus and Cicero's changing opinion of Romulus reinforces my argument that the two characters are related.

---

117 See *RRC* 433/1 (figure 9) and 2, minted by Brutus and portraying his ancestor; it is too early (c. 54 BCE) to refer directly to the assassination.

118 E.g., Suet. *DJ* 80.3. See Richardson 2011, with bibliography; Richardson 2012:21–3.

119 Cic. *Brut.* 53.8, Brutus *collegae suo imperium abrogaverit, ut e civitate regalis nominis memoriam tolleret*, "deprived his colleague of command so that he could remove the memory of the royal name from the state." The fact that Cicero can relate this tale shows that Brutus failed to eliminate that memory.

120 Cic. *DRP* 2.53, "banished the innocent Collatinus, suspicious of his relationship [to the kings], and the other Tarquins because their name was offensive."

Our surviving sources suggest that Brutus is not as unquestionably heroic as modern scholarship has assumed. The expulsion of the Tarquins is never questioned, but Brutus' later actions are. In the former case, Brutus acts justly on his own; he can be criticized when he has to interact with an equal colleague. Livy, Dionysius, and Cicero all express varying degrees of doubt about the justice of his expulsion of Collatinus; Dionysius and Vergil even question Brutus' motives during the conspiracy of the Tarquins. Taken together, these sources characterize Brutus as an ambiguous figure. Like Romulus, he is the benefactor of the city when he acts alone; but also like Romulus, he first eliminates his fellow-ruler. As such, Brutus' story reveals elements of dyadic rivalry.

The historiographic tradition, however, is not univocal. Although Brutus could be portrayed with some of the characteristics of a tyrant, he was still the founder of the Republic, and this was a crucial aspect of his story that could not be omitted. In Poucet's terminology, this is a *motif classé*; Brutus as tyrant is a *motif libre*, an element that was subject to change based on authorial goals. An important question, then, is what these authors gained by casting Brutus in the guise of a tyrant. As in the case of Romulus, it is probable that Brutus' story is a tale of potential transgression. But Brutus shows an improvement over the original founder. Where Romulus consistently tried and failed to share power, Brutus ultimately succeeds. His success, however, is limited; in all versions of the Brutus story that we possess, Brutus dies in battle soon after establishing Republican government. His early death is significant: first, unlike Romulus' long reign, Brutus' tenure of *imperium* does not have a chance to sour. Even more important is the second point, that Brutus loses his life fighting against his regal foes. In this way, his Republican behavior cancels out the earlier tension with Collatinus. Brutus is remembered for his virtuous behavior because he dies in a virtuous way.

The depiction of Brutus as a second and improved Romulus is consistent with Roman accounts of the foundation of the city. As Cicero stresses, Rome, unlike Greek cities, was the product of many men working together to obtain the best form of government.[121] The same sentiment is echoed in Livy's summary of the regal period.[122] This process of continual improvement did not end with the establishment of the Republic. Later heroes were also depicted as founders of Rome, and were likewise subject to the same ambiguities. As we

121 See e.g. Cic. *DRP* 2.2–3, 27.

122 See Livy 2.2; Konstan 1986 and Pausch 2008 for the importance of the theme of the gradual growth of Roman institutions in Livy. Miles 1988:193–204 discussed the *conditor* theme in great detail, with more examples than I consider here; I am less convinced by his closing argument for the strongly topical references to Antony (pp. 206–8).

will see in the next chapter, the interrelations between Brutus and Camillus—new founders, new Romuli, and occasional tyrants—are as strong as those between Brutus and Romulus.

Conclusion

The themes of the Romulus and Remus story are also present in other legends of early Rome. Although these stories are not as well attested as the story of Romulus and Remus, they show a similar development to the story of the twins. The presence of dyadic rivalry in these other narratives substantiates my claim that this is a pattern, rather than simply a motif of the Romulus saga. Unlike Romulus and Remus, Brutus and Collatinus are not brothers. Nevertheless, their stories share the same concerns. This is not the plot of dynastic intrigue, but a standard Republican (and perhaps even more generally political) narrative. Their stories thus show the greater flexibility of dyadic rivalry as an analytical tool compared to biological relationships as an important thematic link between different historical episodes.

The differences between Dionysius and Livy are indicative of the potential of dyadic rivalry as a heuristic mechanism. It does not convey a single message, but rather the recognition of a problem and an attempt to think about it through legends. In some cases, the existence of earlier versions allow us to see the development of this pattern from the second to the first century. The fragmentary nature of Republican historiography means that this development must be filled in from a series of points, rather than reconstructed in full. The general trend seems to show that earlier versions are less likely to indicate conceptual problems with relationships of shared power. For example, the probable absence of Numitor from the poetic accounts of Naevius and Ennius indicates that in their accounts, the strife between Romulus and Remus was an anomaly, rather than an inherited problem of the Roman people. The role of Numitor in Fabius Pictor is less clear, and may have been more in line with what we see in later accounts; it is far from certain, however, that the idea of an *avitum malum* existed prior to Livy. This connects Livy's narrative of the foundation with his contemporaries, such as Horace, who stressed the problematic nature of Romulus for later generations.

The introduction of dyadic rivalry seems to have occurred only at a later stage of the tradition, or was emphasized more strongly by later writers. Such a theme was more topical in the first century, when Rome's government was constantly being pressured by single figures who possessed far more power than was ideal (and sometimes even more than was permissible). The story

of Brutus is a story about ends, means, and consistency of behavior. Although Brutus' ultimate goals are noble, he does not always achieve them in an ideal way. The expulsion of Collatinus offers an example of this. Brutus' lingering ambiguity is not fully expelled by his immediate acceptance of a successor to his colleague. A reader remembering Romulus would know that successors are equally disposable. This raises questions about the nature of tyranny as the unjust exercise of power; it, too, may lie in the eye of the beholder. To Collatinus, Brutus' actions are unjust, and he is afraid. For Collatinus, Brutus is a tyrant. Yet for the reader who knows the full story, Brutus is a hero—eventually.

The fluctuation in the characters of figures like Brutus in this era invite the reader to consider the boundaries of justice and liberty. It was a period of changing political and social climates, and an era of frequent accusations of tyranny, domination, and mistaken loyalties. This upheaval made myth a particularly potent tool to think with. Despite the negativity that sometimes surrounds these legendary figures, their stories remain important for the history of the Republic and the identity of elite readers in the late first century.

CHAPTER 8

Tyrants

Legendary Rome saw two founders after Romulus: Brutus and Camillus. The latter two, while building on Romulus' achievements, did not entirely escape the problems of dyadic rivalry that plagued the founder of the city. In the case of 'second' founders such as Brutus and Camillus, we have a Republican government in Rome; kingship is no longer immediately at issue, and these men are not explicitly censured for their regal authority. But they share many of the characteristic ambiguities seen in the story of the founder, indicating that the interplay of ambition and collegiality continued to be an important theme in the ways that Roman authors thought about history.

As we have seen with Brutus and will explore in more detail with Camillus, the use of the dyadic pattern can be transitory. Multiple stories and story-types exist for the founding figures of Rome. In the case of Camillus, the pattern of dyadic rivalry is mixed with not only his role as founder, but also with the discourse of tyranny. Camillus' major rival, M. Manlius Capitolinus, is one of the men who aimed at *regnum* at Rome in the early Republic.[1] The element of dyadic rivalry is most marked in the case of Manlius, which may be linked to Camillus' status as a new founder of the city. Although only Livy's narrative of these men survives complete, it is full enough to offer important conclusions. Chief among these is the strong possibility that Camillus is a late addition to the tale that reshapes the narrative to resemble the conflicts of the first century more closely. This is particularly marked in the noted similarities between Camillus and Marius, Caesar, and Augustus. But Camillus, like Janus, looks both forward and backwards. The addition of Camillus, the city's second founder, to Manlius' story also provides a parallel to the tale of Romulus and Remus.

Manlius Capitolinus and Camillus

For the story of Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus, we have only Livy's narrative; all of the other sources are fragmentary or, like Cicero, simply allusive. The usual problems with having only one narrative are compounded in this case,

1 There are in fact more of these than the canonical three; see Smith 2006:55, with references on p. 63n21. The Bruti and other initial conspirators to return the Tarquins should be added to his list. See also Mommsen 1879:153–220 and Neel forthcoming on this problematic category.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_010

because it is difficult to discuss the career of Manlius without a significant digression on Camillus. Camillus is not only his adversary, but also the focus of his obsession and the alleged cause behind his attempts to gain favor with the *plebs*. The rivalry that Manlius constructs between himself and Camillus is strongly shaped by the dyadic paradigm, reflecting Manlius' desire for political dominance in Rome. He sees Camillus, whose military exploits both before and after the Gallic sack won him great acclaim, as an equal who is unjustly preferred to him. This disrupts the normal structures of elite competition, making the contest between Manlius and Camillus unfair. In other words, from Manlius' perspective, we have a case of dyadic rivalry; from the perspective of other actors in his narrative, we do not. Chafing at what he perceives as an imbalance is what leads Manlius to seek *regnum*. Thus the earlier career of Camillus is crucial to the discussion of Manlius' alleged attempt to gain the kingship and colors his attempt at tyranny.

Like Romulus, Camillus has garnered much attention as one of the founding fathers of Rome. His similarities to first-century politicians in particular have made him a fruitful figure of analysis, although opinion differs on whether Livy's depiction is flattering or subtly subversive.[2] As was the case in his account of Romulus, it seems likely that Livy purposefully leaves the interpretation of Camillus open. Livy's ambiguity in the case of Camillus is particularly relevant when contemporary resonance taken into account. Like Romulus, Camillus can be seen in both favorable and very unfavorable lights. The evolution of the Camillus character from the regal figure of book 5 to the Republican hero of book 6, if related to Augustus at all, would be a model for, not a portrait of, the *princeps*. But Livy's Camillus, while potentially similar to late Republican dynasts, is unlikely to be closely connected to a single one of them—not even Augustus. Indeed, Livy's Camillus would not be a very flattering model for Augustus, although he might be good to think with.

Camillus' relationship with Manlius Capitolinus is more rarely explored. It is generally accepted that Livy has either elaborated upon the Camillus narrative or combined two quite different traditions.[3] The result is a Camillus who

2 See Ogilvie 1965 *ad locc.* (Augustus); Burck 1966 (Augustus); L'hoir 1990 (Augustus); ver Eecke 2008:119–21 (connecting Romulus/Camillus with Marius), 263–7 (with Cicero), 344–51 (with numerous figures). See also Stevenson 2000 (various figures), Coudry 2001:61–3 (Augustus), Mineo 2003 (Augustus and Scipio Africanus), and Takacs 2008 (Caesar). The pro- and anti-Augustan traditions have been thoroughly summarized, with full bibliography, by Ridley 2010 and 2013.

3 This latter point is a common theme of most, if not all, scholarly work on Camillus. See particularly Gaertner 2008, with references; Farrell 2013.

is not only a larger-than-life figure, but also one whose importance is enduring and underpins the fifth and sixth books of Livy's history. Livy is at pains, particularly in book six, to depict Camillus as the second founder of the city. As I will argue, though, Camillus' story, like the story of Romulus, has darker undertones.

The early career of Camillus shows four significant parallels to the story of Rome's kings. Two (the triumph and the word *conditor*) relate Camillus to Romulus; two more subtle references (the prophecy at Veii and the temple of Mater Matuta) associate him with the sixth king, Servius Tullius. Such parallels between Camillus and regal figures set an important precedent for his later behavior against Manlius and helps construct their story as a narrative of dyadic rivalry that is centered on the issue of executive power. Camillus' links to the kings may be concomitant with the career of Manlius, which seems to have been altered in the mid-first century.

This change may also mark when the aspect of dyadic rivalry was introduced into the tradition. As we have seen, Livy's narratives tend to be more ambiguous than similar accounts.[4] Although there is very little evidence for Manlius outside of Livy, the little we have suggests that Livy's narrative does not emphasize dyadic rivalry as strongly as it could have. Because Livy depicts Manlius as a tyrant, his account offers the opportunity to examine dyadic rivalry in comparison to other modes of tyrannical discourse.

Livy's history reveals changes in Camillus' character over the course of the two books in which he features. The early Camillus shows profound differences from the mature hero. As Paul Martin argued, Camillus is an ambiguous character with close connections to the kings.[5] Although he opposes a man who is charged with *regnum*, Camillus' initial association (like Brutus') is with regal figures and tyranny. This association can be de-emphasized, as we see in Cicero; the orator's references to Camillus are as a symbol of Republican and military *mores*, not as a quasi-monarch.[6] But this association, when stressed, can make Camillus a figure whose virtue has the potential to pose a threat to the city. Livy takes a middle path. Although his Camillus is largely a Republican

4 Oakley 1997:646 suggests that this subtlety and lack of bias is true of Livy's history (or at least the second pentad) as a whole.

5 Martin 1982:375, Camillus has "une 'gloire royale' qui … fait de ce héros républicain un émule et un rival, mais aussi un continuateur des rois de Rome"; see also Takacs 2008, who is too optimistic about the historicity of this narrative. The degree of trust placed in historiographic narratives of this period varies widely; for relatively balanced accounts of the historicity of early Rome, see e.g. Purcell 2003 and Cornell 2005.

6 See Cic. *Dom.* 86; *DRP* 1.6; *Sest.* 143; *Tusc.* 1.90; *Cael.* 39; *Pis.* 24.

hero, enough of his regal aspect remains to leave the reader questioning this early depiction.

In previous chapters, I argued that the figure of Romulus is polyvalent and can be portrayed as a beneficial monarch or as a tyrant. The author determines which aspect of the founder he wishes to stress. Livy makes it clear that Camillus is a new Romulus; thus in his history we are primed for Camillus' display of the same polyvalence, as well as the introduction of a new Remus. These expectations are fulfilled in the change between the regal Camillus of book five and the Republican hero of book six who is Manlius' opponent and dyadic rival. The groundwork for this development of Camillus' character is laid out in the four comparisons between Camillus and the kings.

Camillus' similarities with Servius Tullius appear at the beginning of his career. Such regal passages are often passed over in favor of Camillus' later, more Republican behavior, but they are important to his overall character development.[7] The first is the rededication of the temple of Mater Matuta. Camillus vows that if he captures Veii, he will renovate the temple of Mater Matuta, which has not received attention since Servius Tullius.[8] Although the restoration of temples is fairly common act, Camillus' restoration of Mater Matuta's temple gains added significance from the fact that we have not yet heard about this temple's existence. Livy mentions the initial foundation here, drawing attention to the fact that the king was the founder and Camillus the first restorer of the temple. Mention of Servius is not necessary; Livy does not always mention the founder of a temple when he announces its renovation.[9] That he does so here indicates his desire to associate Servius Tullius and Camillus. The goddess was also closely associated with that king.[10] This unusual double reference creates a strong link between founder and refounder.

The other reference to Servius Tullius is more pointedly about kingship. It occurs during Rome's war with Veii, which Livy carefully casts as a new struggle between the forces of monarchy (the Etruscans) and liberty (the Romans).[11]

---

7 See e.g. Ogilvie's comment on Camillus in Livy 5: "for later ages Camillus was the prototype of the great statesman who despite the ingratitude of his fellow-citizens and the turmoils [sic] of the times remained loyal to Rome and to his principles ... He was the prototype of the elder Scipio, of Sulla, of Augustus himself" (1965:669–70). Hellegouarc'h 1998:156n28 suggests that "la carrière de Camille présente ... des disparates et des incohérences qui ne sont peut-être dues qu'à une déformation progressive de la legende."

8 Livy 5.19.6, *refectam dedicaturum*.

9 E.g., Livy 34.44.5.

10 See e.g. Ov. *F.* 6.477.

11 See Livy 5.1: the people of Veii gain a monarch just for this war, angering and alienating the other peoples of Etruria.

As the Roman troops tunnel under Veii, they hear a mysterious voice. It turns out to be a *haruspex* prophesying about the *exta*: whoever cut them would win the war. The soldiers seize them and return them to their commander Camillus.[12] This must be compared to an object of a similar prophecy under Servius Tullius, a heifer whose slaughterer will gain the victory for his side in the Romano-Sabine war.[13] Moreover, we see a further, if vague, parallel to Brutus and Romulus. Both of these earlier founders are victorious because they take advantage of divine advice; Brutus, in particular, capitalizes on an oracle not explicitly meant for him to secure command. As we see here, the soldiers help Camillus gain the victory by taking sacrificial meat from the king. We should seriously consider the possibility that this prophecy, given to a king, is not only about military victory, but also political control.

As he did with Servius Tullius, Livy makes two comparisons between Camillus and Romulus. Of these, one is more subtle, while the other is explicit. Calling Camillus the second founder of the city is a fairly obvious allusion.[14] The contemporary references that one might see here—to Julius Caesar, Augustus, even Pompey or Sulla—are numerous and have been much discussed.[15] The triumph is more complex. According to Livy, Camillus' triumph is the most grandiose event Rome has ever seen. Camillus himself drives a chariot with white horses, a hubristic act which only happened three known times in Rome before Livy: under Romulus, Camillus, and Julius Caesar.[16] Ogilvie has argued that Livy's portrayal of the triumph was "tone[d] down" from fear of offending Augustus.[17] In contrast, it seems that Livy is at pains to point it out. Two aspects are stressed here. The very fact of the triple triumph may have recalled Augustus, or at least the quadruple triumph of Caesar; the triumph with white horses, along with the coming defeat of the Gauls, was more reminiscent of Caesar and Marius. We can then see multiple different strands of the tradition, one of which (the triple triumph) was almost certainly contemporary

12 Livy 5.21.8–10.

13 Livy 1.45.4–7; the parallel is thematic rather than verbal. Hubaux 1958:282–5 connects the eating of the *exta* with a ritual to guarantee victory; he adds the examples of Remus at the Lupercalia and an oracle given to Sulla (related by Augustine, *CD* 2.24).

14 Livy 5.49.7, *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis … appellabatur*, "he was called 'Romulus', father of his country, and a second founder of the city."

15 See Ogilvie 1965 *ad loc.*; Alföldi 1971; Stevenson 2000; ver Eecke 2008:119–21, 263–4, 345–51, all with further bibliography.

16 Livy 5.23.4–7 (horses at §5); cf. Prop. 4.1.32; Verg. *Aen.* 3.537 for Romulus and white horses.

17 Ogilvie 1965:680; similarly, Oakley 1997:448 on Livy's "romantic idealization of heroes" such as Camillus.

to Livy, if not his own.[18] These allusions to events in the recent and remote past indicate the continuing importance and re-evaluation of these stories through the first century.

The choice of kings is also significant. Like the other figures under examination, Romulus and Servius Tullius are ambiguous and offer a troubling model for a Republican hero. Both are often depicted as ideal monarchs. We have seen that Cicero in his *de Re Publica* stresses that Romulus is a Republican-like king; similarly, Livy claims that Servius Tullius would have abdicated, if he had not been murdered.[19] Yet both are also associated with tyranny: Romulus at the end of his reign, and Servius Tullius at the beginning of his.[20] Although these two kings could be seen as beneficial monarchs, they could also be seen as threats; the character that is stressed, tyrant or beloved ruler, is the choice of the narrator. Livy takes advantage of this ambiguity in his depiction of Camillus, and also in his account of Manlius, who sees himself as Camillus' foil.

Like Camillus', Manlius' career begins in book five. Yet Camillus holds the spotlight without rival prior to the Gallic attack. It is Manlius' heroism in repelling the Gauls that brings him closer to Camillus' level and sets the stage for the conflict to come in the sixth book. It is at this point that we begin to see dyadic rivalry. Both strive to be the leading man in the Roman Republic, a struggle that is rooted in their roles as the saviors of Rome. Manlius first protects the citadel from external attack; once the Gauls are inside the city, Camillus comes to Rome's rescue with an external force. Thus they work towards the same ends, but as opposites. In fact, their careers are almost mirror images:[21] before the Gauls come, Camillus is in exile, while Manlius Capitolinus is well-respected enough to be the *interrex*.[22] After the Gauls have been repelled, this

---

18 The traditional date for Livy's composition of the first pentad is between 27 and 25 BCE; this has been called into question most recently by Burton 2000, who proposes that the Camillus narrative was written in 30/29. If the triumph was among the last additions, my argument works in Burton's scheme as well.

19 Cic. *DRP* 2.14–16; Livy 1.48.9. See Oakley 1997:498 and 505 for the idea that Livy draws purposeful contrasts between past and present.

20 Livy 1.15.8 and 1.41.6–42.2. See Martin 1982:375 for the argument that Camillus' similarities to Servius Tullius are an ancient part of the tradition; p. 363, that the equation of Camillus and Romulus is old.

21 See Hellegouarc'h 1998:163, Capitolinus' story "a paru dans une certaine mesure une réduplication de celui de Camille" and Manlius himself "apparaît d'un bout a l'autre chez notre historien [Livy] comme un 'anti-Camille'." Cf. Kraus 1994:148, itemizing similarities.

22 Both had been consul, Manlius in 392 and Camillus (as a consular tribune) in 401, 398, and 394. The exact positions held by characters in the early Republic is difficult to determine. The consular fasti often differ considerably from the annalistic accounts and have

situation flips. Camillus is now highly respected, while Capitolinus falls prey to his own jealousy and is executed as a traitor.

But the story of their opposition is quite possibly a late arrival to the tradition. Although Livy's account has been influential because it is so full, other narratives do exist in fragmentary form. The differences between Livy and other historians suggest that Livy has altered his narrative in order to accentuate the clash between Manlius and Camillus. Our earliest evidence for Manlius comes from a fragment of the early first-century annalist Claudius Quadrigarius:[23]

> Manlius, quem Capitolium servasse a Gallis supra ostendi, cuiusque operam cum M. Furio dictatore apud Gallos cumprime fortem atque exsuperabilem respublica sensit, is et genere et vi et virtute bellica nemini concedebat.[24]

The emphasis on Manlius' positive qualities is important, particularly since he is mentioned together with Camillus. Even in the earlier tradition, we see the combination of equality and competition that I have argued is essential to dyadic rivalry. Quadrigarius' account was not wholly complimentary; he also seemed to say, like Livy, that Manlius' exceptional qualities made him a threat.[25] But these same qualities make him more of Camillus' equal. Manlius was upset because of a perceived injustice in the competition between himself and Camillus, establishing the two of them as dyadic rivals.

Quadrigarius is vague about Camillus' role in the repulsion of the Gauls: it is not clear if the dictator is fighting or arrives when the battle is over. Since the activities of Camillus and Manlius at the sack establish them as two men of significant military and political power working towards the same goal, a crucial

---

significant problems of authenticity in themselves; see Mora 1999:56 and 66–91 (his first appendix is also quite illuminating). The earliest consuls are, of course, the most susceptible to changing traditions. Mora 1999:90 places the consolidation of the *fasti* tradition in the latter third of the second century, which means that the surviving sources are all using a heavily interpolated version of events. On the consular tribunes, see e.g. Staveley 1953; Yakobson 1999:190–95; Pittenger 2008:54–66 (with bibliography).

23 For a discussion of the date, with bibliography, see Beck-Walter 2004:109; *FRHist* I.288–9 [Briscoe].

24 Quadrigarius (*FRHist* 24 F3 = 7 Chassignet = 7 B-W = 7 P); Gell. 17.2.14, "Manlius, who had saved the Capitol from the Gauls (as I showed above) and whose feat in the case of the Gauls, alongside Marcus Furius [Camillus] the dictator, was felt by the Republic to be particularly bold and outstanding, was second to none in birth, physical power, and military prowess." The phrase *vi et virtute* is briefly discussed at *FRHist* I.23 and III.301.

25 Quadrigarius (*FRHist* 24 F4 = 8 Chassignet = 8 B-W = 8 P); Gellius 17.2.13; cf. Livy 6.20.14.

criterion for dyadic rivalry, the potential absence of this theme is significant. A parallel omission is visible in the Diodoran account of the Gallic attack.

Diodorus' account relates that Camillus is appointed dictator only for the war with the Volsci.[26] During the Gallic siege, it is Manlius (or, as Diodorus calls him, Mallios)[27] alone who manages to repel the Gauls who climb up the walls of the citadel: διόπερ πρεσβευομένων τῶν Ῥωμαίων περὶ διαλύσεως, ἐπείσθησαν χιλίας λαβόντες λίτρας χρυσίου τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπεῖν καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ῥωμαίων χώρας ἀπαλλαγῆναι.[28] Wiseman argued that in the second century BCE, the story of the Gallic sack was quite different: Gauls entered the city through tunnels and managed to capture the Capitol. Manlius, the commander of the Roman army, managed to expel the attackers. Later on, however, he became proud and arrogant, was put on trial, and was executed.[29] Wiseman's argument—that the story gradually developed into the Livian version over the course of the first century, beginning with Claudius Quadrigarius and reaching its current version probably with Valerius Antias[30]—finds support in the fact that a different version seems to appear in Ennius and Cicero, and has been widely accepted.[31] Livy's sources, then, offered a number of possibilities for this story; he deliberately chose the version in which Camillus and Capitolinus clashed.

Livy purposefully chose to emphasize the political rivalry between Manlius and Camillus because, as Mary Jaeger puts it, the story told this way offers "an extended play on . . . the definition of a leader at Rome."[32] This offers Livy a broad range of observations, reinforcements, and corrections on the history that he has told so far. Emphasizing the parallelism between Camillus and

26 von Ungern-Sternberg 2006:53 notes that Livy is the first to include the tradition about Gaul. Skutsch 1985:306 and 315 argues that Camillus and the Gauls was an Ennian innovation. On the general tradition, see e.g. Wiseman 1965; Horsfall 1987; Jaeger 1993; Gaertner 2008.

27 See Wiseman 1965 for the equation of the two names elsewhere, although Dionysius uses the same spelling for Sp. Maelius (12.1–4).

28 DS 14.116.7, "Because of this, when the Romans sent an embassy for a cease-fire, the Gauls were persuaded to take one thousand *litras* of gold, leave the city, and evacuate Roman territory." The entire story of the Gallic sack is found in DS 14.113.4–117.7. DH 13 fr. 6–9 seems to tell the same story as Livy (see Gaertner 2008:30).

29 Wiseman 1979b, particularly pp. 48–9.

30 Quadrigarius: Wiseman 1979b:40–1; Antias: Wiseman 1979b:49.

31 See Skutsch 1985:350 on line 185 (cf. pp. 405–8); the quotation is from Cicero (*Off.* 1.38). See also *Ann.* 154–5 for possible fragments of Ennius' Gallic tale. Note too that Wiseman's proposed reconstruction is the inverse of Camillus' capture of Veii; thus even in the earlier versions there may have been similarities between Camillus and Manlius.

32 Jaeger 1993:351–2; *contra*, Takacs 2008, arguing that Livy de-emphasizes this conflict.

Romulus sets up expectations of dyadic rivalry by encouraging the reader to reflect upon Remus. This role is quickly filled by Manlius, whose jealousy of Camillus in Livy finds a parallel in Diodorus' description of Remus' jealousy of Romulus at the foundation of the city (φθονῶν δὲ ταῖς εὐτυχίαις τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ).[33] Livy may then have transferred part of the tradition about Remus that he had earlier passed over—his jealousy of his brother—into the Manlius tale. The similarity between Manlius and the twins is reinforced at Manlius' eventual trial, where Livy remarks upon his *cupiditas regni*, the ultimate source of conflict between Romulus and Remus.[34] Aside from Romulus and Remus and Numitor and Amulius, the only time before Manlius that Livy uses this phrase is in regard to Publicola. Together with the Manlius tale's other similarities to the Romulus and Remus story, the phrase acts as a signpost, again encouraging the reader to look for parallels between the two narratives.

Livy's narrative asserts that the strife between Camillus and Manlius lies squarely on the latter's shoulders. After the Gallic threat has passed, Manlius becomes extremely jealous of Camillus and his successes in the political sphere:

> Qui nimius animi cum alios principes sperneret, uni invideret eximio simul honoribus atque virtutibus, M. Furio, aegre ferebat solum eum in magistratibus, solum apud exercitus esse; tantum iam eminere ut iisdem auspiciis creatos non pro collegis sed pro ministris habeat; cum interim, si quis vere aestimare velit, a M. Furio reciperari patria ex obsidione hostium non potuerit, nisi a se prius Capitolium atque arx servata esset; et ille inter aurum accipiendum et in spem pacis solutis animis Gallos adgressus sit, ipse armatos capientesque arcem depulerit; illius gloriae pars virilis apud omnes milites sit qui simul vicerint: suae victoriae neminem omnium mortalium socium esse.[35]

---

33 DS 8.6.1. It is perhaps stretching the parallel to link Remus' later comments about invaders with the Gallic sack.

34 Livy 6.20.5; cf. 1.6.4, *regni cupido*. Oakley 1997 does not note this parallel *ad loc*.

35 Livy 6.11.3–5, "Capitolinus scorned the other leading men with a too-haughty spirit; he was jealous of one in particular, M. Furius Camillus, who was notable for both his public honors and his manly spirit. Manlius Capitolinus did not bear it well that this man was the only man for the magistrates and for the army, for he considered himself already so distinguished that the men who had been assigned magistracies under the same auspices as he had were not like colleagues, but like attendants to him.... Meanwhile, if anyone wanted to judge the matter fairly, the fatherland could not have been saved from the enemy's treachery by Camillus, unless the Capitol and the Arx had been saved by Capitolinus himself first. The former had attacked the Gauls when they were distracted with getting

Manlius' jealousy drives the story. He feels that he is Camillus' equal and perhaps even superior, and cannot tolerate the greater acclaim granted to his rival. His thoughts cast Camillus in the role of king: the emphasis on Camillus as *solus* puts him alone at the head of state and army.[36] Moreover, Manlius cannot bear Camillus' superiority. This explicit and focalized view of a dyadic rivalry is the strongest we see in Livy's surviving books. Manlius realizes that Camillus has gained fame for a deed that both accomplished. But he does not know that he is a dyadic rival. The reader does, and his knowledge of the story is activated as the parallelism between Remus and Manlius unfolds.

The words that Livy uses to express Manlius' feelings, *aegre ferebat*, hark back to Romulus' lack of concern at the death of Titus Tatius (*minus aegre ... tulisse*).[37] This is a significant echo. Although *aegre* in itself is unexceptional, Livy's usual idiom is *aegre patior*. In the entire first decade, *aegre fero* occurs only in these two instances. The repetition then seems purposeful: Romulus does not mind when Titus Tatius has died, because it puts an end to their rivalry; Manlius minds Camillus' success all too much.

For Manlius, the ideal dyadic relationship has backfired, and the lesser man has come out ahead. This is the worst kind of unfair competition. We can here see the tension between ambition and collegiality expressed on both sides. Manlius associates himself with the gods and values his own contribution to the Roman state more highly than Camillus' success. He wants to be a lone hero himself, although he recognizes value in the equality that ought to exist between Roman nobles. But he also notes that Camillus does not act correctly: he treats his fellow magistrates *non pro collegis sed pro ministris*. This is tyrannical behavior.[38] Manlius' accusation thus reinforces the picture of Camillus as a tyrant that we saw in Livy's fifth book.

The validity of Manlius' assertions has been called into question. Stephen Oakley argued that "the readers of book v and the first ten chapters of book vi, where Camillus has been dominant and highly successful, are not meant to be

---

their money and hoping for peace, while he himself had fought them off when they were armed and about to take the citadel. Every soldier who was victorious with him had a part in Camillus' glory; no mortal was the companion of his victory."

36 For this see Oakley 1997 *ad loc.*

37 Livy 6.11.3; 2.14.2.

38 See Oakley 1997:444–9 on Camillus' own reaction to being nominated leader of his fellow consular tribunes. In general, my analysis supports Kraus (1994)'s conclusions that Camillus is ambiguous over Oakley's view of Livy's romanticism.

persuaded" by Manlius' charges.[39] But this line of reasoning is not universally accepted. Christina Kraus, in contrast, averred that Camillus' behavior justifies Manlius' claim.[40] Yet her assessment can be made even stronger. As Oakley pointed out, even early on in book 6 Camillus describes himself in terms fitting for a monarch, "almost unwittingly."[41] Maybe that is true of Camillus the character, who does act appropriately for his time. But it is certainly not true of Livy; his choice of words is not accidental. The point here is that Camillus' virtue can be called into question; he is an ambiguous figure, like Romulus or Brutus. Interpreted through the lens of dyadic rivalry, this story becomes less univocal: it is not only about a Roman aristocrat who oversteps, but rather about two Roman aristocrats who vie with one another to establish the limits of acceptable behavior. Such an interpretation allows for a variety of interpretations on the part of the reader, which Livy's subtle narrative does not force.

When Livy comes to narrate Manlius' misdeeds, they are surprisingly small: he sees a brave soldier being harassed for debt and publicly pays to have him released.[42] The man swears loyalty to Manlius in gratitude, placing his obligation to a single man ahead of his obligation to the state. Oakley remarked on the threat in this act: "the insistent repetition [of *unus* in this episode] emphasises the danger to the state."[43] But this interpretation seems to be based on knowledge of Manlius' later trial for treason. Ennius had famously described Fabius Maximus as a hero by stressing the theme of *unus homo*, and Manlius' own thoughts, as related by Livy, tend in the same direction. A more flattering story about Manlius could capitalize on that parallel.[44] Manlius is depicted as a man who thinks he is a great leader. The tale of the soldier capitalizes on the ambiguity of Manlius' tale.

Manlius' generosity with the soldier is not very different from the deeds of other wealthy men who sympathized with the plebs, and indeed Livy later includes this act among Manlius' virtues.[45] As has been previously noted, Livy's

---

39 Oakley 1997:477.

40 Kraus 1994:149.

41 Oakley 1997:445, on Livy 6.6.9.

42 The soldier shows his battle scars to gain sympathy, an act that will be mirrored by Manlius at his trial; see 6.14.5 and 20.9. On the political significance of showing scars, see e.g. Leigh 1995.

43 Oakley 1997:478.

44 Enn. *Ann.* 363 Sk., *Unus homo nobis cunctando restituet rem* ('one man by delaying restored the state to us'). On this theme, see Farrell 2013.

45 Livy 6.20.6, with Oakley *ad loc.* The sentiment is not unique to Livy; see e.g. Cic. *Off.* 2.58 on the positive value of popular largesse.

condemnation of Manlius is based on fragile evidence,[46] and Livy himself admits that he cannot find sufficient proof of Manlius' guilt.[47] When speaking of Manlius' activities and speeches, Livy says that they were revolutionary *if* you knew the motives behind them.[48] This implies, as in the case of the soldier above, that Manlius' actions were equivocal; it may also indicate that at least some earlier stories about Manlius made him a more honorable figure.

Livy's account of Manlius as a noble who rescued soldiers from their debts may have earlier roots. Quadrigarius, as we saw, related this tale in the first book of his history. This book is excerpted in the seventeenth book of Aulus Gellius, which claims to choose passages based on linguistic interest. These excerpts, however, appear in roughly chronological order. Thus Gellius' account may include a fragment of Manlius' oratory, either the "seditious" ones that Livy speaks of or the speech at his trial. In this fragment, we see that *nihil sibi … divitias opus esse.*[49] In Livy's account, one of Manlius' suspect activities is selling his patrimony. The similar sentiments in the Quadrigarius fragment and Livy's account of Manlius' speech to the people, along with the proximity of the fragment to other elements of the Manlius tale, suggest that the sale of familial estates also featured in the earlier history.

The problems in Livy's narrative suggest that the earlier tradition about Manlius was complex and had undergone changes by Livy's day. Livy's account, then, should not be taken as representative of the entire tradition. Instead, he pays due attention to the characterization of Manlius, at least at first. The abrupt change in Manlius' character after his trial is jarring for a reader, perhaps intentionally. Part of the way through his story, Manlius becomes a stereotype.

This tangle is likely to have been caused by the amalgamation of a pro- and anti-Manlius story, and a desire to make them fit into a more meaningful discursive framework—dyadic rivalry. This suggestion is similar to (but the opposite of) Wiseman's hypothesis that the Manlius story was originally about a tyrant whose deeds alienated the people.[50] But either option would still have

46 Kraus 1994:190–197; Oakley 1997:487–8.

47 Livy 6.18.16.

48 Livy 6.14.2; Oakley (1997)'s commentary *ad loc.* is useful on the textual difficulties of this passage.

49 Quadrigarius (*FRHist* 24 F25 = 26 Chassignet = 26 B-W = 26 P); Gell. 17.2.15, "he had no need of riches." Beck-Walter, following Peter, assign it to the tale of M'. Curius Dentatus. This is disputed by *FRHist ad loc.* [Briscoe] on chronological grounds (cf. III.309–10), rightly. Gellius has it immediately following the Quadrigarius fragments on the Gauls (above, nn. 24–25). A similar sentiment may still have been put in Manlius' mouth; cf. Livy 6.14.10.

50 See Oakley 1997:490 (following Wiseman 1979b:48–9): the original story probably told of "the prosecution, conviction, and flogging to death of an enemy of the people."

required the continuation of Manlius' tale far beyond its original confines of the sack.

The narrative grows more clearly contradictory when Manlius agrees to a trial and behaves quite reasonably throughout the entire episode. In the meantime, the Struggle of the Orders continues; the imprisonment of Manlius does not help the situation at Rome. The lack of resolution also suggests that Manlius' treason is somewhat artificial. He only becomes a threat after he is released. But at this point, his individual motivation largely disappears, and he transforms into a stock character type.[51] This is coincident with the expansion of Livy's narrative to fill a second year, which most commentators consider late. At this point, we see Livy's own goals for the narrative most clearly, with a lesser role played by the general tradition. Soon after Manlius' downfall, his virtue is emphasized when the plebeians miss him. Their longing for him is expressed in similar terms to Ennius' description of the popular longing for Romulus.[52] Manlius is executed because he tried to be a king, but he is remembered as a just leader, not a tyrant.

Manlius acts correctly when he is accused of *regnum*. He approaches the dictator at the tribunal, and he attends his own trial. The imposition of a tyrannical stereotype on Manlius, whose character had previously been heroic, also requires an equally heroic opponent: the other city savior, Camillus. According to Oakley, the annalistic tradition "create[d] a conflict between the two heroes of 390."[53] Indeed, this conflict would intensify in later accounts; Plutarch and Zonaras increase Camillus' role in Manlius' downfall.

The opposition of two men whose earlier careers had been much more similar falls into the pattern of dyadic rivalry. The constant presence of Camillus in Manlius' story, continued if not created by Livy, expresses the problems inherent in military and political prominence. Manlius is militarily capable and, if we follow Quadrigarius, has the other qualities that are necessary for political

51 Jaeger 1993:358, Livy's "sources have left him no clear evidence to support the accusation that Manlius was trying to become tyrant," and therefore "he must give Manlius a fitting character for a would-be tyrant." Compare Oakley 1997:480, there is "only a hint that Manlius desired tyranny" in Livy's narrative.

52 See Livy 6.20.15, *eius desiderium tenet*, with Oakley 1997 *ad loc*: "the expression is rare" and probably "echoes Ennius" (*Ann.* 105 Sk). A similar phrase is found in Cic. *DRP* 2.25; see Cole 2006:537–8. For the idiosyncrasy of Cicero's account, see Büchner 1984:185; Cole 2013:85–103.

53 Oakley 1997:486, among other comments about the expansion of the Manlius narrative to fill two years; cf. Wiseman 1979b:45–9, suggesting that the involvement of Camillus is a late invention, possible originating with Valerius Antias. See also Plut. *Cam.* 36.1–9; Zon. 7.23.10.

success at Rome: good family and *vis*, which could even perhaps be understood here as "charisma" in contrast to his *virtu*[*s*] *bellica*.[54] He expects a certain degree of respect and prominence. When that is not forthcoming for him, but rather for Camillus, he aligns himself with the common people in order to gain more power.

Livy uses the contest between Manlius and Camillus to problematize the question of political power after the Gallic sack. The two men each have a claim to primacy in Rome and clash over the impossibility of reconciling their claims. In Livy's depiction, Camillus' recurrent dictatorships and exceptional *auctoritas* mark him out as the top man in Rome. Although Manlius desired this role, he took his ambition beyond what was acceptable.[55] In the end, Livy's conclusion reaffirms Camillus' dominance of Republican politics for the remainder of his life. But this dominance also associates Camillus with the individual leaders of the late Republic, thus making this Republican hero tyrannical in his own right.

Regnum

The story of Manlius and Camillus, as I have argued, has strong undertones of regal language. This is also true of the related tale of Brutus and Collatinus. In this penultimate section, I focus on the intersections, overlaps, and contradictions among different discourses of power in the Roman Republic. Tyranny in Rome could be the subject of a book in itself; thus this section is by necessity selective, focusing on only two possible parallel discourses for each tale: Greek tyranny and *affectatio regni*.

The topic of tyranny in ancient thought is inextricably bound to ideals of freedom and servitude. Freedom, whether defined politically or legally, can be conceptualized as "freedom from" oppression (perhaps more typical in modern thought) or "freedom to" act as one wishes. It is generally agreed that ancient political thought focused more on the latter, and that self-regulation was a defining characteristic of freedom. As Valentina Arena has recently argued, it is the arbitrary nature of rule (tyranny, perhaps *regnum*) that makes it unjust; in Rome, *libertas* was defined in a dual sense, with citizens selecting laws and

54 For parallels in Plautus and Cicero, see *FRHist* III.301. In these parallels, *vi* is not used metaphorically.

55 On the issue of 'overreaching oneself', see Morgan 2007:73–4; Neel forthcoming.

magistrates ensuring that they were upheld.[56] The Roman kings, while not tyrants, nonetheless ruled in a system of imperfect liberty: "a commonwealth governed by a monarch or a faction [is] … itself unfree, since it rest[s] upon the goodwill of those in power."[57] Thus, there is a progression from free society (Republic, democracy) to less free (just monarchy or oligarchy, still including basic citizen rights) to unfree (slavery, *dominatio*, tyranny).

This progression, like the Polybian *anacyclosis*, does not necessarily proceed chronologically or developmentally, and is admittedly a construct.[58] It is also markedly similar to the most basic form of a common theme in Greek political thought: that the power of governance in any given place could be divided into three basic types (rule by the one, the few, or the many).[59] None of these systems, it must be stressed, was inherently good or bad; instead, the overall character of the regime was dependent on those who governed.

The tyrant, then, is in many ways the polar opposite of the just king. This entails the recognition that one (the tyrant) is a bad ruler, while the other (the monarch) is a good ruler.[60] The question of good government is intimately

---

56 Arena 2012:74–5 (one example of many in her book); older, but still useful, are Wirszubski 1960 and Hellegouarc'h 1963.

57 Arena 2012:78. For a similar conception with an orientation more towards political science, see Kalyvas 2007. The idea itself is ancient; see my discussion of Cicero's *de Re Publica* in the following section.

58 See Hahm 2000:473–6 for an explanation of the biological determinism of the Polybian account. Flower 2010 suggests that this biological arc has unduly influenced our picture of the Republic, leading us to mischaracterize various stages in its history. This complaint is in some ways anticipated by Hahm 2000:465 and Wiedemann 2000:526, who argue, respectively, that Polybius' description of the Roman constitution is heavily influenced by Greek thought, and in particular by the Achaean League of Polybius' youth, and that therefore it is a poor model for our own understanding of Republican Rome. Cf. Gabba 2000:126, who argues that "con ogni probabilità già in Polibio Servio Tullio era raffigurato come il βασιλεὺς, fra Romolo μόναρχος e Tarquinio τύραννος"; but we have no way of ascertaining this. For the semantics of kingship in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, see Delcourt 2005:222–39, and, with particular reference to the Tarquin tradition, 345–52.

59 This system, with various small permutations, is pervasive in Greek thought; see Hdt. 3.73–83, Plato *Polit.* and *Rep. passim*, Arist. *Pol.* (esp. 1279a22–82b6), Plb. 6.5–10.

60 The description of the good form of single-man rule, conventionally called "monarchy", is laid out in greatest detail in Plato's *Republic*. Compare *Polit.* 302b9–303a6, where laws are the determinant of what makes a good or bad regime. Arist. *Pol.* 1279a17–21 sees as a just constitution any that has the interests of the governed, rather than the governing, at heart; the analogies he uses to express this point (king as master over slave population; king as head of household over wives and children) were used in the triumviral period (see Roller 2001:248). Despite protestations to the contrary, *rex* does not have an

connected to ethical behavior, a feature that appears later in Cicero.[61] So long as the leader(s) of the state remain just, the system of government will as well; when this situation changes, the form of government also changes.[62] With this established as a baseline, albeit one that is rooted in Greek philosophical theory, we can examine the figure of the tyrant more closely. Roman thought on tyranny adopted a great deal of Greek political theory; its emphasis on ethics, however, is crucial to the examination of dyadic rivalry.

In Greek conceptualization of tyranny, it was possible for a tyrant to benefit his city. For example, the building program of the Peisistratids benefitted Athens. The increased security that came from having a single man in charge could also be a benefit.[63] Tyrants were also sometimes known for moderation,[64] and the Greek tyrant acted as a mediator between the aristocracy and the rest of the people. Civil war could not benefit a tyrant; although his position was secure in times of moderate civil strife, when elite and common people would not join together against him, a greater degree of strife (*stasis*) made his position equally insecure.[65] Thus the position of the Greek tyrant was a constant balancing act, and the reward for holding the greatest amount of power in the polis is the constant fear of being ousted from one's position. A tyrant was not necessarily someone to be envied.

In Greece, prevailing traditions about the tyrant were often negative. They came to power illegally and died violently. James McGlew argued that Greek tradition offered a series of aristocratic alternatives to tyranny in the form of lawgivers, founders, liberators, and tyrannicides. It is at this point that the Roman historical tradition becomes more relevant. Brutus, for example, can be described by almost all of those terms. In that sense, he fulfills his expected

---

inherently negative value; see e.g. Linderski 2002a:589n6 for examples. See also Beck 2009 and Potter 2011 for the increasingly regal posturing of Roman aristocrats in the second and first centuries BCE.

61 Cf. McGlew 1993:208; Atkins 2000:477 and 497; Schofield 2000:199, with Plato *Rep*. 471e–73a; Atkins 2013:110–13.

62 The basic scheme is as follows: (A) monarchy (just) devolves into (B) tyranny (unjust), which is replaced by (C) aristocracy, which in turn is replaced by (D) oligarchy, followed by (E) democracy, and ending in (F) anarchy, which can only be stopped by the power of a single man, thus returning to (A).

63 On this aspect, with specific reference to modern philosophies on tyranny, see Boesche 1996:7.

64 McGlew 1993:141n43 and 141; as examples of clemency, he offers DS 9.12.3 and DL 1.76. *Contra*, Béranger 1935:93, that Caesar's *clementia* was intended to show his contemporaries that he was not a tyrant. See also Grimal 1979.

65 McGlew 1993:73. See also e.g. Raaflaub 2003; the papers collected in Lewis (ed.) 2006.

role as founder of the Republic. In Greek thought, however, the tyrant also tried to commandeer these aristocratic models. Tyrants represented themselves as founders, often founders of a new dynasty (which they could be; for example, the Peisistratids in Athens and Bacchiads in Corinth), and altered laws so that they could represent themselves as lawgivers.[66] In many ways, the tyrant was the aristocrat *par excellence*, and he used aristocratic values to represent his own virtues and political regime.[67]

A similar dynamic is at work in Roman memorialization of dyadic rivals. As in the case of tyranny, these stories problematize the dynamics of foundation and the struggle to uphold Republican ideals of collegiality while satisfying the increasing ambitions of the political elite.

Brutus, as we have seen, is an ambiguous figure. He fulfills an oracle about ruling the city and then liberates it from its tyrannical rulers. He breaks the king's laws, but scrupulously maintains his own, even when his sons' lives are at stake. He agitates for the removal of his colleague, but immediately replaces him with a new one. These apparent contradictions problematize the figure of the liberator; although he is the savior of his country and the founder of Roman government, he is dangerous for the same reasons that he is useful. As his actions proved, a man who begins a government can also end one. In the case of Brutus, there is no need for concern. Although he does not live long after the dismissal of Collatinus, his virtue is strong enough to support the maintenance of Republican government.

Manlius' story betrays a similar concern for the double-edged nature of salvation. Although he is most famous for saving the city, Manlius ultimately endangers it because of his inability to live up to Republican ideals. In Livy's sixth book, this moral struggle is intensified because we see it performed by both Camillus and Manlius. Camillus' struggle succeeds: when he is named superior to his fellow consuls, he chooses a colleague to maintain Republican ideals; his actions when he has more power than is technically desirable never transgress into *regnum*.[68] Manlius, on the other hand, fails—but Livy's account of

---

66 This cut both ways; see McGlew 1993:94–121 on Solon's similarities to a tyrant; mythological kings could also be tyrants, with Sophocles' *Oedipus* perhaps the best example.

67 See McGlew 1993:215. We know in actuality very little about how such tyrants represented themselves from a historical perspective; instead, what we do know is how later writers depict them as representing themselves (for example, Herodotus' account of Peisistratus at 1.56–68). However, this is a complicated locution, and so I prefer "tyrants' self-representation" rather than "the representation of tyrants' self-representation."

68 Compare Oakley 1997:445, Livy "believed that his heroes or other important politicians were of such stature that their election was a formality and that their colleagues existed only to keep the constitution."

this failure is more ambivalent than we might expect. That is because Manlius' story is closely tied to two other stories of attempted kingship: that of Spurius Cassius in book 2 and Spurius Maelius in book 4.

It has long been argued that the narratives of Cassius, Maelius, and Manlius are to a degree historical fictions. The narratives of their attemps at tyranny and eventual downfall were reshaped in the first century to reflect the polarized narratives of Republican history. Andrew Lintott, Francisco Pina Polo, Gary Forsythe, and others have argued that stories of tyranny in Rome are late additions to the historical tradition and explicitly modeled on the Gracchi. These *affectatores regni* are limited in number and solely work to benefit the *plebs*. Their creation is often ascribed to the optimate killers of Tiberius Gracchus in particular, who invented or reused past events to gain a legendary precedent for his illegal murder.[69] But the Gracchi are not the only historical figures who acted in a way similar to these *affectatores*. Catiline too offers a number of broad parallels with their stories, particularly in the case of Manlius; others have argued that the tales are reminiscent of Saturninus and Clodius, or indeed any number of "popular" politicians.[70] It has also been suggested that the stories share a triadic structure. The pattern, supposedly invented by Cicero, was aimed at discrediting 'popular' tactics such as land distribution and free grain. This progression has been outlined in great detail by Paul Martin, who discerns two levels of concerns: land, grain, and money as the basis of *regnum* within the narrative; and social rank, viability of accustion, and plebeian opposition as extra-narrative structure.[71]

It is fairly clear that gaining popular support was one path to becoming a tyrant, whether in Greece or in Rome. Thus, these narratives (and others that are similar) offer Romans an alternative way to think about executive power and ambition. As we can see with Manlius, the two types of historical pattern—attempting kingship and dyadic rivalry—can both be present within a single tale without necessarily disturbing the arc of the narrative. These patterns are not necessarily complementary, nor are they mutually incoherent. Rather, they

69 Lintott 1968 and 1970; Forsythe 1994; Pina Polo 2006. See also n. 71 below and Neel forthcoming.

70 See e.g. Valvo 1975; Seager 1977; Gutberlet 1985; Linderski 2002b.

71 Martin 1982:343 provides a table of similarities between the three stories, arguing for a strong Gracchan influence; Martin 1990:251 develops this categorization. Pina Polo 2006:82 agres with Martin on the pigeonholing of the three *affectatores regni*; all "were intensely interested in the main problems of the *plebs* in the context of economic and social crisis," but in entirely different areas: Cassius in land, Maelius in food, and Capitolinus in cash. See further e.g. Vigourt 2001:281 and Chassignet 2001:87. *Contra*, Roller 2010:119n5, rightly.

enrich the narrative for the reader, offering more options for understanding Rome's past and more lessons that can be applied to her present.

The Rival-less *Rector*

Up to this point, I have analyzed historiographical texts and various genres of poetry, archaeological remains, numismatics, and ritual performance. Such evidence deals with questions of ethics and politics obliquely. In this final section, I turn to material that addresses these issues directly: the political philosophy of Cicero. In this genre, if in no other, we would expect to find conclusive statements about the value of different types of authority, applicable to dyadic rivalry. Cicero's *de Re Publica*, the major surviving work of Roman political philosophy, does not disappoint this expectation. Cicero's dialogue, which I have already discussed as a historical narrative, probes the issue of balance within government. My focus here is on the nature of *imperium* and *regnum*, and if it is possible for two (or more) to rule. As we saw in the previous section, multiple discourses on tyranny could co-exist in Roman historical writing. With the *de Re Publica*, we see one attempt to unify those discourses into a theory. Cicero's *rector*, his leader of the ideal state, embodies the struggle I have argued exists in dyadic rivals.

Written between 54 and 51 BCE, the treatise takes place in 129 and features a discussion between Scipio Aemilianus, his companion Laelius, and a number of other friends about the best condition for the state (*de optimo civitatis statu*, 1.70).[72] This treatise provides the most accessible and explicit picture of Roman political philosophy from the period under consideration, although Cicero's perspective may not have been either representative or static. The *de Re Publica* has been studied at length for various reasons; I am concerned only with the ideal leader that the dialogue puts forward and how that figure fits into the varied discourse of leadership at Rome. I argue that Cicero's *rector* is a single individual, whose power is based in ethical rulership; the *rector* is the opposite of the tyrant. This single leadership eliminates the possibility of

72 The dates of composition come from Cicero's correspondence; see *QF* 2.13, 3.5.1–2; *Att.* 5.12. I have used Powell's text and numbering throughout. For recent modern discussions of the work as a whole or in part, see e.g. Büchner 1984; Gigante 1995:34–5; Powell 1994; Penwill 1995; Fox 1996 and 2007; Leclerq 1996; Asmis 2001; Cornell 2001; Powell and North (eds) 2001; Fantham 2004; Beness 2005; Dench 2005:110; Stevenson 2005; Lintott 2008; Atkins 2013 (esp. pp. 80–119); Cole 2006 and 2013:85–103; and Nelsestuen 2014.

tension at the peak of the political hierarchy, ensuring the safety of the state in a time of crisis.

Cicero's debts to Greek philosophy are varied and well-documented, although his dialogue is strongly centered in Roman history.[73] The cycle of constitutions described earlier in this chapter is adopted by Scipio in book 1; Scipio, however, offers a new alternative to the Greek forms of monarchy in the person of the *rector*. Cicero leaves the number of concurrent *rectores* open, which invites the reader to imagine that at times, a single *rector* may be a better option for the state than an oligarchic system. In my reading, then, the figure of the *rector* displays an implicit tension between the beneficial *imperium* of a just individual head of state and the disaster brought by unjust leaders with similar powers.[74] Cicero allows for the possibility that a *rector* may be necessary to disempower the self-interested elite. As this tension between the individual and the group has not been universally accepted, I will discuss it in some detail, beginning with Scipio's contentious support of monarchy in book one.

Scipio's stance on monarchy (the best of the simple forms of government, but inferior to the mixed constitution) has often been regarded as odd or wavering.[75] True rule is only possible under a monarchy, since there is no true control without a single ruler.[76] Unsurprisingly, this statement is questioned by Laelius, who throughout the surviving portions of the book speaks as the representative of the traditional Republican system; Cicero's own identification with Laelius perhaps indicates serious concerns about the system Scipio puts forward.[77] By the end of the book, once he has detailed the various changes of government, Scipio decides that monarchy is inferior to a Republic.

---

73 See e.g. Büchner 1984:20; Krarup 1974:456; Ferrary 1984; Perelli 1990:38; Atkins 2013:56–61; Nelsestuen 2014:148–51.

74 For a similar argument regarding Plato's *Republic*, see Schofield 2009.

75 See e.g. Cic. *DRP* 1.61–2; Zetzel 1995:19 expresses amazement at the degree of praise offered by Scipio to the monarchy; Atkins 2013:70–72, in contrast, considers it as solely an ideal and never to be practically implemented. Büchner 1984:523–32 offers a full and balanced discussion.

76 Cic. *DRP* 1.60, *in qua si in plures translata res sit, intellegi iam licet nullum fore quod praesit imperium, quod quidem nisi unum sit esse nullum potest*, "If the state is handed over to the rule of many men, then one must understand that there can be no control (*imperium*), since indeed it cannot exist except as a unit."

77 Cicero's use of Laelius is frequent and fairly consistent; see e.g. *Fam*. 5.7.3 and the citations in Martin 1980:855n35. Cole 2013:15 argues that Laelius' views mature over time. Atkins 2013:35–6 offers a salutary reminder that neither character speaks with Cicero's voice.

Scipio's desire to assign *two* 'best' forms of government—one to a certain extent idealized, the other more practical—follows the problems explored in dyadic rivalry. At times of great stress to the state, it is possible for "the romantic idea of the single political hero" to save the state;[78] in political life as Cicero knew it, such individuals routinely caused disaster by being too ambitious and, at the same time, not wise enough philosophically to govern the state with perfect justice. The character of the leader is essential to the status of the government as either bad or good.[79] In the end, this is true regardless of the state's constitution; in a monarchy, however, the bad leader is unchecked and thus has greater potential for damage than in the more balanced mixed constitution.[80]

Attempts to connect Cicero's presentation of Scipio with current political events have met with little consensus.[81] Although Pompey held his sole consulship in 52, possibly providing fodder for Cicero's political rumination, Cicero is no clearer in his support for Pompey than in his praise of monarchy. Pompey had received Cicero's aid earlier in his career (for example, in Cicero's speech on the Manilian law). After Pompey's refusal to confront Clodius and keep Cicero from exile, however, Cicero was disappointed and disillusioned, and often withdrew support.[82] In letters to Atticus from the early 50s, Cicero speaks of Pompey as a tyrant who has betrayed the cause of his supporters.[83] Pompey's

78 Powell and North 2001:5.

79 Cf. Perelli 1990:95, who states that Cicero focuses on the leader, rather than the type of government. DRP 3.46–8 reinforces this assertion: here Scipio argues that the *optimates* are worse than a single good king. A similar point about the problems with the nobility is made by Mummius in Sall. BJ 31.1–4, indicating that Cicero was not the only Roman of the Caesarian period to perceive such problems.

80 See Bréguet 1980b:143n1 (to p. 35); Powell 1994:25–7; Powell and North 2001:4. Perelli 1990:37–9 argues that Cicero seeks the unity of *imperium* rather than a particular form of government; cf. Ferrary 1988:99.

81 Wirszubski 1960:43 argues that Scipio's constitution owes much to the reforming program of Sulla (on which see Flower 2010:117–34); cf. Morstein-Marx 2004:111n197 for Cicero's sympathies with, although dislike of, Sulla; Dowling 2000 for Sulla's better qualities. Sulla was not the sort of citizen that Cicero had in mind as the leader of the state: see Gildenhard 2011:223–5; Atkins 2013:73–9. For the choice of a strong leader as a response to the problems of the late 50s in particular, see Béranger 1935; Martin 1980; Achard 1990; Powell and North 2001; Fox 2007; *contra*, Zetzel 2001:95, Nelsestuen 2014:169.

82 Cf. Bréguet 1980a:137–9 and Lintott 2008:241 on Cicero's changing long-term vision of the work and his interaction with Pompey; similarly, Lintott 1968:2 on Cicero's opinions of the *amicitia* of 59.

83 Cic. *Att.* 2.12–21; tyrant explicitly at 2.14.1 and 17.1; betrayal at 2.19.3. Cicero would later make similar complaints about Caesar (e.g., *Att.* 9.4.3, from 49; 14.7.6, after the assassination) and vacillate between support for Pompey (*Att.* 9.13) and depictions of him as tyrannical (e.g., *Att.* 9.10.2, Pompey is like Sulla).

growing ambition, particularly in the face of the challenge to his power from Julius Caesar, made him a less suitable candidate for the leadership of state that he seemed to desire so greatly—at least in Cicero's eyes. Cicero's conception of a leader was someone who, while he did not necessarily lack ambition, was more concerned with the state's welfare than his own reputation. Such worries are broadly similar to those expressed in dyadic rivalry: the problem of reconciling ambition with the need for collegiality, the concern over fair play, and the need to balance benefit to the Republic with benefit to oneself. These issues hark back to the questions we saw raised in Ennius, and it is no accident that our knowledge of Ennius is so dependent on Cicero.[84]

Cicero was still writing the *de Re Publica* during Pompey's sole consulship, and thus had the opportunity to observe his actions as the chief man in Rome. But this unusual office was granted at least in part because of concerns about Caesar, and this is what is stressed in historical accounts of the late Republic. Although modern historians have recently suggested a more nuanced picture of the late Republic,[85] ancient authors more commonly presented a story of the clash of two men over matters of ambition and power.[86] The appearance of these themes in ancient historiography reinforces their significance in political philosophy, and vice-versa.

The second important issue for our understanding of Cicero's dialogue is the shadowy figure who is introduced in book two and is called variously the *rector* [*rei publicae*], *gubernator*, and *princeps* [*civitatis*], among others.[87] Because the dialogue is so fragmentary, the *rector* remains much discussed. Some scholars argue that there was only one rector at a time. An older generation of scholarship thought that his role was equivalent to that of a king;[88] this view has fallen out of favor.[89] Other work on the single *rector* sees him as a mask for Cicero himself.[90] Jonathan Powell has suggested that the *rector* is a career politician, and that Cicero probably envisaged several in power at once.[91] On this reading,

84 See e.g. Zetzel 2007; Elliott 2013, esp. pp. 75–82.

85 See e.g. Flower 2010 (esp. pp. 85–90, 135–53) and Hölkeskamp 2004 [2010].

86 See e.g. Cic. *HR* 54; Sall. *BC* 53.6–54.4 is similar in conception, although not about political power. For modern scholarship, see e.g. the works at p. 56n9.

87 Fotiou 1984:53 provides a list of the terms Cicero uses.

88 E.g., Reizenstein 1924; this view is still supported by Fotiou 1984.

89 E.g., Michel 2001:59 calls the leader a "héros" similar to Pericles; Valditara 2004:110 says that he cannot be a king, because he is both elected and subject to law.

90 E.g., Martin 1980; Achard 1990; and Jehne 2003:390. A thorough discussion of this figure, including the relevant scholarship up to the time of its publication, can be found in Bréguet 1980a:128–42. See also Büchner 1984:57–61; for the history of these ideas in Greco-Roman political thought, *id.* pp. 517–32. For a recent discussion, see Atkins 2013:73–9.

91 Powell 1994, followed by Nelsestuen 2014:167.

the *rector* is not only versed in political craft, but he is a benevolent sage; the extent of his power is not clear. I suggest that Cicero did not rule out the possibility of having only one *rector* in power at a given time. The *rector* is thus similar to the eventual survivor in the pattern of dyadic rivalry in that both are single leaders who exercise power to the benefit of the community.

The figure of the *rector* is introduced at the end of Scipio's excursus on the history of Rome in *de Re Publica* 2. In book two, Scipio begins with Romulus; the endpoint has been lost.[92] Scipio then breaks off from the narrative proper to explain again the evils of tyranny; there is a break in the manuscript, and when it picks up, he is discussing the role of the senate and people even in a monarchy. It seems that his point is that just kingship still involves participation on all levels.[93] Scipio then reiterates that even under the best kings, there is the lingering fear of tyranny.[94] He returns to the tyranny of Tarquinius Superbus, and explains that in Rome, tyranny first occurred by misuse of legal power, rather than an unjust seizure of power. In contrast to this misuse of power is the *rector*, whose experience makes him a good administrator of justice and governor of the state:

> ut, quem ad modum Tarquinius, non novam potestatem nactus, sed quam habebat usus iniuste, totum genus hoc regiae civitatis everterit; sit huic oppositus alter, bonus et sapiens et peritus utilitatis dignitatisque civilis, quasi tutor et procurator rei publicae; sic enim appelletur quicumque erit rector et gubernator civitatis. quem virum facite ut agnoscatis; iste est enim qui consilio et opera civitatem tueri potest.[95]

---

92 Perelli 1990:96 suggests the historical review stopped around 300; Bréguet 1980a:42, with the decemvirs; Zetzel 1995:206 implies that the narrative may have continued down to 129.

93 Cic. DRP 2.50; note in particular that the senate held *summam consilii … cum imperii summam rex teneret* ("supreme advisory power, while the king held supreme command") and that the people must not have too much power, just enough to *potestatem gustandi* ("taste it").

94 Cic. DRP 2.50, *timor, ne rex, quod plerumque evenit, exsistat iniustus* ("a fear that there will be an unjust king, because this frequently occurs"). For Cicero's description of Tarquin and tyranny, see e.g. Büchner 1984:188–9 and 220–23.

95 Cic. DRP 2.51, "Exactly in this way Tarquin destroyed this entire type of city, the regal one, not by acquiring new powers, but using unjustly the power that he had. With him should be compared another man: good, wise, experienced both in service and in public merit, like a guardian or an administrator of the state; for whoever will be the director and the helmsman of the state will be so called. Make sure you recognize this man; for it is he who will be able to protect the state by his advice or deeds …" Note the changes in vocabulary used to describe this man (*tutor*, *gubernator*, etc.).

The direct comparison to Tarquin, who is unquestionably a tyrant, means one of two things for our understanding of the statesman. Either this man is a good king, like Romulus or Numa, or he is a leading man with exceptional powers, similar to the status of the dictator.[96] Because the statesman is here compared directly to Tarquin, it is probable that he is in this instance a single man acting as the head of state. Powell interpreted this passage as "establish[ing] the existence of a class of persons designated as *rectores* [... etc.]: a category which includes the sub-class of good monarchs *but also includes others as well*."[97] While likely, this analysis does not identify a set number of *rectores* who would be in power at once. Cicero's terminology is not particularly helpful; he sometimes speaks of the *rector*, sometimes of *rectores*, without any indication that he realizes the difference.[98] We have lost the section, if it existed, in which Cicero informed us whether these plural *rectores* governed together or in sequence.

It is possible to set the *rectores* in parallel with Cicero's discussion of the consuls in *De Legibus*.[99] He here uses sometimes the plural and sometimes the singular, which must be understood as a collective singular. But this parallel may be misleading. In *De Legibus*, we know that it is a collective singular because we have both the law that there will be two consuls and the discussion of it, mentioning only one consul. In contrast, the introduction of the *rector* at *DRP* 2.51 speaks of a single *rector*, albeit one who is part of a larger group of *rectores*. Judging by Cicero's discussion here, there is only one *rector* at a time, although there may have been many over the course of the Republic.[100] That it was possible to have a single *rector* is supported by the evidence of a Byzantine manuscript espousing its own political theory.[101] The existence of

---

96 See e.g. Bréguet 1980a:137 and 1980b:167n1 (to p. 78); Lintott 2008:235.

97 Powell 1994:22; original emphasis. I am not convinced by his argument for a tautology here.

98 E.g., Cic. *DRP* 2.51, 5.5–6 (singular) vs. 6.13 (plural). Powell 1994:26 suggests that the number is inconsequential to Cicero.

99 Cic. *Leg.* 3.8 and 3.16.

100 Cf. Dyck 2004:481 and 487: Cicero stresses the similarities between *Leg.* and *DRP*, and the change from single to multiple magistrates constitutes "a difficulty in his argument" (p. 487). See also Atkins 2013:17–25.

101 See Fotiou 1984. The manuscript makes frequent reference to both the *DRP* and Plato's *Republic*. In a summary of the *DRP*, the anonymous author of the manuscript states that Cicero's state has at its head a king (βασιλεύς) who chooses other leading officials, and that the state itself is a βασιλεία. While the summary of a sixth-century manuscript is not the strongest evidence for Cicero's lost work, as it may have been misinterpreted by the author or (if not used at first hand) by his sources, it is worth noting that the summary

this manuscript does not, of course, guarantee that Cicero intended a single *rector*, but reaffirms the impression that Cicero's use of the singular *rector* is more frequent than that of the plural in the surviving text—and perhaps suggests that this was the case throughout the entirety of the work.

Setting a single statesman opposite a tyrant, as Cicero does in his introduction of the *rector*, establishes dyadic rivalry between them. Both the rector and Tarquin wish to be in charge of the city: Tarquin because he desires power, and the *rector* because he desires justice. It seems that Cicero is implying that the *rector* ought to replace the tyrant and govern the city in accordance with justice and the law. We here have a parallel to Brutus or Camillus, both of whom guide the city with justice after the elimination of a wrongful leader. Cicero's account of the *rector* thus reinforces the notion that we have seen in *de Officiis*: it is the character of the leader, rather than his type, that makes him either good or bad. Although a single man, the *rector* in his wisdom rules justly.

The discussion of the *rector*(*es*) runs parallel to that of monarchy in *de Re Publica* 1. A single *rector* is the equivalent of a just king; his leadership benefits the state, but his office is not hereditary. Such a kingship is illustrated in the first section of *de Re Publica* 2: the kings of Rome are beneficial for the city until the second Tarquin, who is not fit to rule.[102] Once the royal office becomes hereditary, it degenerates. But poor leaders in the mixed constitution are equally unfortunate for the state, as Cicero knew at first hand.[103] This distinction fits with Atkins' argument that Cicero sees a difference between *potestas* and *auctoritas*. The latter has a didactic function and is symbolized by

of Plato is extremely close to the original wording. It does, however, make mistakes: see Fotiou 1984:58n12. Fotiou's article is rarely discussed; however, see Powell 1994:26 on the use of βασιλεύς in Greek philosophical works. See also the summary of Grillius cited by Nelsestuen 2014:135n14, which also indicates a single *rector*, as does the metaphor of the single *vilicus* (although Nelsestuen himself believes that the number is left open; see p. 167).

102 That the *rector* is similar to Rome's early kings (especially Numa) has recently been reiterated by Nelsestuen 2014:133–6. He also argues that the *rector* is quite different from the kings: the development of the Roman state requires the *rector* to become subservient to the *res publica* (seen in the metaphor of the *vilicus* in *DRP* 5). While Nelsestuen's argument for the *rector*'s subjugation to the state is in many ways compelling, the tension bectween *rector*-slave and *rector*-leader remains problematic. His parallel example of Cincinnatus (pp. 153–5) should be a warning: the rector's suitability for rule is in part determined by his lack of desire to rule. Contrast Livy's *regni cupido* (above, p. 189-90 and 215).

103 This is also clear from e.g. Sall. *BJ* 15.4, 28.4–5.

Romulus, the "original *auctor.*"[104] The *rector* possesses this authority as well, making him an heir to Romulus the rightful king—but also, potentially, at risk of succumbing to ambition like his model.

The *rector* guarantees his continued suitability for office (or, if he is not in office, his continued potential to be a good governor) by continuing to educate himself, primarily practically.[105] He also offers a check on aristocratic strife by providing an effective replacement for the aristocracy. His reward is not more power, but apotheosis.[106] Cicero's ideal leader, like the exemplary leaders of early Rome, was not supposed to want power. By encouraging potentially disruptive leaders with posthumous rewards, Cicero offsets the tension between ambition and tradition. In his formulation, the traditional drive to achieve is acceptable, provided that the exceptional prizes garnered by this achievement come only after death. True virtue is separated from the squabble over offices and honors. The *rector* will possess such virtue, and will (like Cicero) bide his time.

If the ambition of the elites at the head of state grows too great, the presence of a *rector* may even be necessary for the state's salvation. This is addressed, briefly, by Cicero at the beginning of his treatise.[107] In this regard, Cicero shows his practical experience in Roman political life. Entrusting the state to a single man who seems to be a *rector* is risky; he too may turn out to be a tyrant.[108] This is why Scipio is so careful to describe the training and background of the *rector*, although this is now lost to us. He also urges his audience to be able to recognize the true *rector*, who is the protector of the state.[109] In uncertain cases, granting power to multiple men may be safer than granting it to the wrong individual. As the historical situation faced by the participants of the dialogue makes clear, however, a hereditary oligarchy is subject to problems similar to those of a hereditary monarchy.[110] Thus it is the character of the *rector* that is the true essential, rather than how many of them there are.

104 Atkins 2013:108.

105 See Cic. *DRP* 5.5; it is assumed that he has already learned the laws.

106 See Cic. *DRP* 6.13, *omnibus, qui patriam conservaverint, adiuverint, auxerint, certum esse in caelo definitum locum* ("there is a certain place in heaven that has been marked out for those who have saved, aided, or increased their country"); similarly, §20–29. On the issue of divine rewards for civic service, see Alföldi 1985:275–9; Cole 2013.

107 Cf. Cic. *DRP* 1.1.

108 See Scipio's comments on the problems with monarchy at Cic. *DRP* 1.69, and discussion above, pp. 226–227.

109 See Cic. *DRP* 2.51, *facite ut agnoscatis* … ("ensure that you recognize …").

110 Also noted by Powell 1994:27.

This requirement returns us to historiography and its didactic aims from political theory. Cicero's focus on the morality of the leader in order to determine the justice of a government type is one that we saw in the case of tyrants and dyadic rivalry as well. Reliance on an individual's character as a means of judging his power pervades ancient thought on rulership, establishing a link between different types of tyrannical discourse. Regardless of how many leaders a state has, it is essential for them to be of good character. Similarly, by showing the decisions made by leaders of the past, historical writing sought to inform the leaders of the future. A leader who knew his history could act like a Brutus or Camillus, rejecting the temptations of too much ambition and keeping to a more traditional path. In turn, historians promised such a figure even greater glory by memorializing his actions.

Conclusion

Manlius and Brutus share certain qualities, as well as having obvious differences. Both are men who struggle against the status quo to establish a society in which their fellow-citizens can live in freedom. Both frame their revolutionary actions as a fight against tyranny. In Brutus' case, it is an actual king, Tarquin the Proud; Manlius depicts the senate in tyrannical terms to underscore the injustice of the plebs' plight.[111] Both suffer from treatment that they perceive as unjust, too. But Brutus, acting in the senators' interests, becomes a heroic founder; Manlius, who acts against the senate, is executed.

This was an all-too-common story in the late Republic. Catiline, after failing to win consular elections, allegedly conspired to overthrow Rome. Cicero does not exploit the story of Manlius or any other would-be king in his own account of the fight against Catiline, but that does not mean that Livy might not have seen some resemblances.[112] These similarities should not be over-stressed, however. There are differences as well: Manlius was, until his conspiracy, a successful hero, while Catiline's career was less spectacular; Manlius' case went to trial, while Catiline's did not; Manlius was executed, while Catiline died in battle.[113]

Manlius' tale bears similarities to other relatively recent conflicts, too. Many politicians had chosen to make a name for themselves or gain more power by

111 See Livy 6.14.3–5.

112 That Sallust does not use Manlius as a precedent for Catiline is less surprising; his account rarely mentions *exempla*.

113 For the latter, see Sall. *BC* 60.7.

helping the urban poor: the cases of Drusus, Clodius, or either of the Gracchi could be added to Catiline. Indeed, Livy's description of Manlius' army of plebeian supporters recalls the urban mobs of Clodius. In attempting to alleviate the debts of the plebs, Manlius recalls Cinna's legislation about debt.[114] His sale of his farm, although voluntary, is reminiscent of the Gracchan redistribution of land, and perhaps Augustus' sale of his property to fulfill the terms of Caesar's will.[115] His troop of loyal followers could bring Clodius to mind, but also the Gracchi.[116] Further reminiscences of the Gracchi and Catiline are present in the anachronistic issuing of the *SCU* against Manlius at 6.19.3. Early first-century conflict calls Manlius to mind as well: the jealousy between Manlius and Camillus may have been echoed in contemporary works on Sulla and Marius;[117] likewise, Manlius' pride and refusal to cede dominance may reflect the tension between Pompey and Caesar. In other words, the background to Manlius' story is strongly reminiscent of the late Republic, rather than a particular event or person.

This story is not only a glorification of Camillus; in some ways, it is quite sad. At the end of Livy's tale, Manlius is executed, and with him dies one of the saviors of the Republic. The ultimate moral of this story is that there is a price to be paid for exceptional virtue: Camillus' role of founder requires the elimination of rivals. This too was a lesson that Rome had learned over the course of the last century. Rivalry between many men may have been acceptable, but not between only two. The clashes of the late Republic, according to ancient historians, were polarized: you were with Cinna or with Sulla, with Pompey or with Caesar.[118] Cicero's letters relay to us some of the trouble he had in taking a stand when he found neither option to be ideal.[119] A similar discomfort

114 Livy 6.15.10–11 in particular, but also 6.14.3–7.

115 Livy 6.14.10.

116 Livy 6.15.2–4.

117 This is a more questionable claim, as the first known description of jealousy between Marius and Sulla comes from Plutarch (*Mar*. 10.14; *Sulla* 3.3–4.4, citing Sulla himself in 4.3); Sallust makes no mention of it, but also refrains from discussing the later history of the two men (see *BJ* 95.4).

118 Whether this was in fact the case is less important for my argument; for this model of Republican politics, see e.g. Cic. *HR* 54 and the bibliography above, p. 56n9.

119 Many of Cicero's letters address the various problems involved in allying himself with either Pompey or Caesar. I offer here only a selection, all from the letters to Atticus (these are more personal, and thus perhaps most likely to reflect Cicero's true opinions at the time): 9.5.2 (to be read with 9.6.4 and 9.7.3); 9.10.2; 9.13; 10.7.1; 11.2a; 16.16.4. Lintott 2008:253–300 provides a much broader survey, with fuller analysis and bibliography; see especially pp. 278–94.

with extremes is apparent in Manlius' tale, and in the tales of dyadic rivals more generally.

In such narratives, Livy pinpoints the same problems that I have discussed in previous chapters: elite ambition and over-assertiveness, and the trouble of reconciling the collegiality and power-sharing required by Republican government with the constant need to do better than one's contemporaries and predecessors. But although he poses the question, he cannot offer a viable solution. Even with Camillus as the leading man of state, we know (as did Livy's audience) that there is still trouble ahead for the city.

But Livy is not wholly complimentary towards Camillus, either. I argued above that Camillus is an ambiguous figure who himself displays similarities to tyrants. His regal qualities connect him not only with Romulus, but also with Brutus. And although there were instances in which none of these founding figures are connected to tyranny, the stories in which they are bear more tantalizing fruit. In these cases, I have suggested, we see Roman authors using dyadic rivalry as a tool to problematize their heroes.

Conclusion

In 44 BCE, Cicero compared Antony with his grandfather. Unlike the present corps of Rome's government, the elder Marcus Antonius had been one of the old school: *libertate esse parem ceteris, principem dignitate.*[1] In other words, he had fulfilled the requirements of ideal Republicanism. While he did not transgress the boundaries of acceptable power, he nonetheless was able to make a name for himself as a great man. Antony, on the other hand, failed to observe these customs; he was closer to a tyrant. Men like Antony problematized the actions of Rome's first leaders. Like Romulus, Brutus, and Camillus, Antony wanted power; depending on whom you asked, this power would be beneficial or disastrous for Rome. Cicero emphasized disaster, but what did Antony's followers see? Possibly a rigid elite, obsessed with their own authority; certainly a better future.

The end of the Republic did not mark the end of Republican heroes. The infant twins Romulus and Remus continued to appear sporadically in literature; so did founders such as Camillus or Brutus. But dyadic rivalry ceased to be an important component of these stories. When Valerius Maximus relates the background to the Lupercalia, for example, he notes that it goes back to Romulus and Remus, *cum laetitia exultantes, quod his avus Numitor rex Albanorum eo loco, ubi educati erant, urbem condere permiserat sub monte Palatino*.[2] Here there is no race, no strife; Amulius is not mentioned, nor is Remus' coming death. Remus is found nowhere else in Valerius. For a writer preserving "memorable deeds and sayings", this omission is revealing: unlike in the mid-first century, Remus is no longer worth talking about. The same holds true for other dyadic rivals: the loser does not merit recognition. Unlike in the Republic, where ideals of fair competition required a losing competitor to be given a second shot, writers of the early Principate perpetuated the memory of success, not conflict.

This is not a static picture. Plutarch's biographies of Romulus and Camillus include their unfortunate rivals; late antique writers, too, show interest in those who failed as well as those who succeeded. For the most part, though, the authors of the Principate turned resolutely away from dyadic rivals. The reasons for this go beyond the scope of this book, but the switch in focus to

1 Cic. *Phil.* 1.34, "equal to the others in freedom, but chief in *dignitas*."

2 VM 2.2.9, "exulting with delight because their grandfather Numitor, king of the Albans, allowed them to found a city in that place in which they had been reared under the Palatine hill."

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004281851_011

Republican heroism or the Stoic sage is telling.[3] These stories emphasized lack of ambition, while dyadic rivalry features it in a central role. Different political cultures found different aspects of the same men (such as Romulus and Camillus) compelling.

In the Republic, dyadic rivalry offered a way to think about competition that was at the same time free from competition itself. This offers a contrast to other uses of legendary ancestors, such as funeral speeches or *imagines*, which emphasized the importance of looking back to the past as a model and potential rival.[4] Historiographic accounts showed two past actors engaged in competition and supplied a moralizing ending; the same accounts also implicated the reader in judging the actions of these legendary actors, thus helping the lesson stick. The issues at stake, although they took place in the distant past, were broad enough to be applicable to the authors' own time.

Over the course of the period in question, one of the key changes in political life was in the nature of elite allegiance. The ideal of Republican government situated power in the laws and delegated that power to the consuls and other magistrates to ensure that the laws were maintained. Competition for these offices was fierce and ultimately required the establishment of age and property restrictions, as well as prerequisite positions. To the initial limitation of a year in office (except for the censors) were added restrictions on consecutive office-holding and on the duration of time between different magistracies. Yet in the second century, these laws were already flouted, and continued to be flouted intermittently through the first century. Legends offered a way to think about the benefits or detriments of such requirements. Men like Camillus or Brutus acted illegally in their tenure of office. Was this technical illegality worthwhile? If so, why? The historical accounts offered readers potential ways to differentiate between a Manlius or a Camillus, and asked them to judge whether such men deserved their different fates.

I have emphasized the double importance of tradition and ambition in Roman society. But even these were evolving targets. As exceptional individuals achieved greater and greater deeds, ambitious young men were forced to strive even harder to equal them, much less surpass them. Similarly, the invention of certain traditions—such as Tubero's insertion of the third group of *luperci* following Julius Caesar—reveals that some 'traditions' were quite new. This continual innovation, in both social and political spheres, is the best argument for the changing nature of dyadic rivalry.

---

3 See e.g. Roller 2001; Sion-Jenkis 2001; and Gowing 2005 for analyses of the Republic in imperial-era texts.

4 See e.g. Wiseman 1974; Flower 1996.

Figures

FIGURE 1 *Panel of the figured frieze from the Basilica Aemilia, Rome.*
PHOTO: AUTHOR'S OWN. REPRODUCED WITH THE KIND PERMISSION OF THE MINISTERO DEI BENI E DELLE ATTIVITÀ CULTURALI E DEL TURISMO—SOPRINTENDENZA SPECIALE PER I BENI ARCHEOLOGICI DI ROMA.

FIGURE 2 *Fresco from the Esquiline Columbarium showing the early life of Romulus and Remus.*
PHOTO: AUTHOR'S OWN. REPRODUCED WITH THE KIND PERMISSION OF THE MINISTERO DEI BENI E DELLE ATTIVITÀ CULTURALI E DEL TURISMO—SOPRINTENDENZA SPECIALE PER I BENI ARCHEOLOGICI DI ROMA.

FIGURE 3 *Detail of figure 2.*
PHOTO: AUTHOR'S OWN. REPRODUCED WITH THE KIND PERMISSION OF THE MINISTERO DEI BENI E DELLE ATTIVITÀ CULTURALI E DEL TURISMO—SOPRINTENDENZA SPECIALE PER I BENI ARCHEOLOGICI DI ROMA.

Works Cited

The following standard reference works are referred to by abbreviation only: T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (*MRR*); *The Cambridge Ancient History*, second edition (*CAH*²); *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (*BMC*); *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (*CIL*); M. Crawford (ed.), *Roman Republican Coinage* (*RRC*); A. Degrassi (ed.), *Inscriptiones Italicae* (*I. Ital.*); F. Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischer Historiker* (*FrGrHist*); T. J. Cornell, E. Bispham, J. W. Rich, and C. J. Smith (edd.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (*FRHist*); *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologicum Classicae* (*LIMC*); *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (*LTUR*); *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumwissenschaft* (*RE*).

Achard, G. "Le *De Republica*: une candidature déguisée?" *Latomus* 49 (1990), 370–82.

Adams, J. N. "Female Speech in Latin Comedy." *Antichthon* 18 (1984), 43–77.

Adler, E. *Valorizing the Barbarians: Enemy Speeches in Roman Historiography*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Albertson, F. "The Basilica Aemilia Frieze: Religion and Politics in Late Republican Rome." *Latomus* 49 (1990), 801–15.

Alföldi, A. *Studien über Caesars Monarchie.* Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1953.

———. *Early Rome and the Latins.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

———. *Der Vater des Vaterlands im römischen Denken.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.

———. *Caesar in 44 v. Chr. Studien zu Caesars Monarchie und ihren Wurzeln.* Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1985.

Alonso-Núñez, J. M. "An Augustan World History: the *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus." *G&R* 34 (1987), 56–72.

Ampolo, C., and M. Manfredini, edd. *Plutarco. Le vite di Teseo e di Romolo.* Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1988.

Andreae, B. "Fragmente eines gemalten Frieses mit Darstellungen aus der Gründungssage Rome." *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom.* ed. H. Speier. 4th ed., vol. 3. Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1966. 461–4.

Arena, A. "Tibullo II,5: la celebrazione di Messalino?" *Latomus* 64 (2005), 362–76.

Arena, V. Libertas *and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Armstrong, J. " 'Bands of Brothers': Warfare and fraternity in Early Rome." *JAH* 1 (2013), 53–69.

Arya, D. A. "Il ratto delle Sabine e la guerra romano-sabina." *Roma: Romolo, Remo, e la fondazione della città.* edd. A. Carandini and R. Capelli. Milan: Electa, 2000. 303–19.

Asmis, E. "The politician as public servant in Cicero's *De Re Publica*." *Cicéron et Philodème: La polémique en philosophie*. edd. C. Auvray-Assayas and D. Delattre. Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm, 2001. 109–28.

———. "A New Kind of Model: Cicero's Roman Constitution in *De Re Publica*." *AJP* 126 (2005), 377–416.

Assmann, J. *Religion and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Astin, A. E. *The* Lex Annalis *before Sulla*. Brussels: Latomus, 1958.

———. *Scipio Aemilianus*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967.

Atkins, E. M. "Cicero." *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. edd. C. Rowe, M. Schofield et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 477–516 .

Atkins, J. W. *Cicero on Politics and the Limits of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Badian, E. "Ennius and his Friends." *Ennius*. ed. O. Skutsch. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972. 149–208.

Baier, T. "Ein Kommentar zum Rechtsdenken der ansgehenden Republik (Liv. 2,3,2–4)." *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bus Livius: Gattungen—Autoren—Kontexte*. edd. U. Eigler, U. Gotter, and N. Luraghi. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003. 235–49.

Baldassarre, I., A. Pontrandolfo, et al. *Pittura romana dall'ellenismo al tardo-antico*. Milan: Grandi Libri dell'Arte, 2002.

Bannon, C. J. *The Brothers of Romulus: fraternal* pietas *in Roman law, literature and society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Baraz, Y. *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Barchiesi, A. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Bauer, H. "Basilica Aemilia." *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik: Eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin 7. Juni–14. Augst 1988*. ed. W.-D. Heilmeyer. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1988. 200–12.

Bayet, J. *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine*. 2nd ed. Paris: Payot, 1969.

Beard, M. "The sexual status of Vestal Virgins." *JRS* 70 (1980), 12–27.

———. "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday." *PCPhS* 21 (1987), 1–15.

———. "Looking (harder) for Roman myth: Dumézil, declamation, and the problems of definition." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms*. ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 44–64.

———. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

———. *Confronting the Classics: Traditions, Adventures, and Innovations.* New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 2013.

Beaujeu, J. "Le frère de Quirinus (à propos de Virgile, *Æneide* I, 292, et de Properce IV, 1, 9)." *Mélanges de Philosophie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Ancienne offerts à Pierre Boyancé.* Rome: École Française de Rome, 1974. 57–72.

Beck, H. *Karriere und Hierarchie: die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des* cursus honorum *in der mittleren Republik.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005.

———. "From Poplicola to Augustus: senatorial houses in Roman political culture." *Phoenix* 63 (2009), 361–84.

Beck, H., and U. Walter, eds. *Die frühen römischen Historiker.* 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001 (2005)–2004.

Beness, J. L. "Scipio Aemilianus and the Crisis of 129 B.C." *Historia* 54 (2005), 37–48.

Béranger, J. "Tyrannus: Notes sur la notion de tyrannie chez les Romains particulièrement a l'époque de César et de Cicéron," *REL* 13 (1935), 85–94.

Bettini, M. *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul.* tr. J. van Sickle. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Bianchi, U. *Il dualismo religioso. Saggio storico ed etnologico.* 2nd ed. Rome: Ateneo, 1983.

———. "Dualism in religious ethnology." *Numen* 57 (2010), 45–9.

Binder, G. *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes: Kyros und Romulus*. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1964.

———. "Kommunikative Elemente im römischen Staatskult am Ende der Republik: Das Beispiel der Lupercalia des Jahres 44." *Religiöse Kommunikation: Formen und Praxis vor der Neuzeit.* edd. G. Binder and K. Ehlich. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1997. 225–41.

Birth, K. "The Immanent Past: Culture and Psyche at the Juncture of Memory and History." *Ethos* 34 (2006), 169–91.

Blaive, F. "Le *flamen dialis* et la liturgie des Lupercales." *Images d'Origines, Origines d'une Image*. edd. A. Deproost and A. Meurant. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 2003. 207–214.

Boesche, R. *Theories of Tyranny From Plato to Arendt.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Bond, R. "Horace's Political Journey." *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. edd. W. J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, and P. A. Roche. Leiden: Brill, 2009. 133–52.

Bonnechere, P., and R. Gagné, edd. *Sacrifices humains: Perspectives croisées et représentations / Human sacrifice: Cross-cultural perspectives and representations.* Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège, 2013.

Boutsikas, E., and R. Hannah. "*Aitia*, Astronomy and the Timing of the Arrhephoria." *ABSA* 107 (2012), 233–45.

Boyd, B. W., ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid.* Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Bréguet, E., ed. *Cicéron. La République*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1980.
Bremmer, J. "Romulus, Remus, and the Foundation of Rome." *Roman Myth and Mythography*. edd. J. Bremmer and N. Horsfall. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies, 1987. 25–48. (= 1987a)
———. "Caeculus and the Foundation of Praeneste." *Roman Myth and Mythography*. edd. J. Bremmer and N. Horsfall. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies, 1987. 49–62. (= 1987b)
Brilliant, R. *Visual Narratives: Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.
Briquel, D. "La mort de Remus ou la cité comme rupture." *Tracés de Fondation.* ed. M. Detienne. Louvain: Peeters, 1990. 171–9.
Briscoe, J. *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Brouwer, H. H. J. *Bona Dea: The Sources and a Description of the Cult*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
Bruggisser, P. *Romulus Servianus. La légende de Romulus dans les commentaires à Virgile de Servius: mythographie et idéologie à l'époque de la dynastie théodosienne*. Bonn: Habelt, 1987.
Brunt, P. A. *Italian Manpower, 225 B.C.–A.D. 14.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
Bücher, F. *Verargumentierte Geschichte. Exempla Romana im politischen Diskurs der späten römischen Republik.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006.
Buchheit, V. "Tibull II 5 und die *Aeneis*." *Philologus* 109 (1965), 104–20.
Büchner, K., ed. *M. Tullius Cicero. De Re Publica*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1984.
Budesheim, J. "Versammlungen des republikanischen Senats in den Templa Roms." *Hephaistos* 24 (2006), 73–8.
Buker, E. A. *Politics Through a Looking-Glass: Understanding Political Cultures Through a Structuralist Interpretation of Narratives.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.
Bunse, R. "Die frühe Zensur und die Entstehung der Kollegialität." *Historia* 50 (2001), 145–62.
Burck, E. "Das Bild der Revolution bei römischern Historikern." *Gymnasium* 73 (1966), 86–109.
Burkert, W. "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus." *Historia* 11 (1962), 356–76.
———. "Oriental and Greek Myth: The Meeting of Parallels." *Interpretations of Greek Myth*. ed. J. Bremmer. London: Croom Helm, 1987. 10–40.
———. "Mythos—Begriff, Struktur, Funktionen." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms.* ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 9–24.
Burton, P. J. "The last Republican historian: a new date for the composition of Livy's first pentad." *Historia* 49 (2000), 429–46.
Butrica, J. L. "Propertius on the Parilia (4.4.73–8)." *CQ* 50 (2000), 472–8.
Cairns, F. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Calame, C. "The Rhetoric of *Muthos* and *Logos*: Forms of Figurative Discourse." *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought.* ed. R. Buxton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 119–43.

———. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece. The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. tr. D. W. Berman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

———. "Myth and Performance on the Athenian Stage: Praxithea, Erechtheus, Their Daughters, and the Etiology of Authocthony." *CP* 106 (2011), 1–19.

Caldelli, M. L., and C. Ricci. *Monumentum familiae Statiliorum: Un riesame.* Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1999.

Cameron, A. "Catullus 29." *Hermes* 104 (1976), 158–63.

———. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Camps, W. A. *Propertius. Elegies Book III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Cancellieri, M. "Le Aedes Castoris et Pollucis nel Lazio: una nota." *Castores. L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma*. ed. L. Nista. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1994. 63–70.

Capdeville, G. "Jeux athlétiques et rituels de fondation." *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique: Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'Équipe de recherches étrusco-italique de l'UMR 126 (CNRS, Paris) et l'École française de Rome (Rome, 3–4 Mai 1991).* Rome: École française de Rome, 1993. 141–87.

Cappelli, R. "La leggenda di Enea nel racconto figurato degli *Aemilii*." *Ostraka* 2 (1993), 57–72.

———. "Il fregio dipinto dell'Esquilino e la propaganda augustea del mito delle origini." *Museo Nazionale Romano: Palazzo Massimo alle Terme.* ed. A. La Regina. Milan: Electa, 1998. 51–8.

Carandini, A. *La nascita di Roma: dèi, Lari, eroi e uomini all'alba di una civiltà.* Torino: Einaudi, 1997. (= 1997a)

———. "Sullo specchio con Lupa, Romolo e Remo (di nuovo a proposito di T. P. Wiseman)." *Ostraka* 6 (1997), 445–6. (= 1997b)

———. *Remo e Romolo: Dai rioni dei Quiriti alla città dei Romani (775/750–700/675 a.C. circa).* Torino: Einaudi, 2006.

———. *Rome: Day One*. tr. S. Sartarelli. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Carbonell, C.-O., and J. Rives, eds. *Mythes et Politique.* Toulouse: Presses de l'Institut d'Études Politiques de Toulouse, 1990.

Cardauns, B. "Zu den Sibyllen bei Tibull 2,5." *Hermes* 89 (1961), 357–66.

Carettoni, G. "Il fregio figurato della Basilica Emilia," *RIA* 19 (1961), 5–78.

Carruba, A. M. *La Lupa Capitolina: un bronzo medievale*. Rome: De Luca Editori, 2006.

Carrubba, R. W. "The Curse on the Romans." *TAPA* 97 (1966), 29–34.

Castriota, D. *The Ara Pacis Augustae and the imagery of abundance in later Greek and early Roman imperial art.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Champlin, E. "Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins." *JRS* 101 (2011), 73–99.

Chapot, F., and Bernard Laurot, edd. *Corpus de prières grecques et romaines*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.

Chassignet, M. "La 'construction' des aspirants à la tyrannie: Spurius Cassius, Spurius Maelius et Manlius Capitolinus." *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique / Die Konstruktion der großen Männer Altroms: Actes du Colloque du Collegium Beatus Rhenanus, Augst 16–18 septembre 1999.* edd. M. Coudry and T. Späth. Paris: De Boccard, 2001. 83–96.

———, ed. *Caton. Les* Origines (*Fragments*). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986.

———, ed. *L'Annalistique romaine*. 3 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1996–2004.

Christenson, D. "Superbia in Vergil's Aeneid: Who's Haughty and Who's Not?" *Scholia* 11 (2002), 44–54.

Classen, C. J. "Romulus in der römischen Republik." *Philologus* 102 (1962), 173–204.

———. "Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus." *Historia* 12 (1963), 447–57.

Coarelli, F. *Il foro romano, periodo repubblicano e Augusteo.* Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1985.

———. "Remoria." *Myth, History, and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman.* edd. D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2003. 41–55.

Cohen-Skalli, A. "Ὁι περὶ τὸν Ῥωμύλον: le motif du 'fondateur' dans le fragment VII, 5 de la *Bibliothèque historique* de Diodore de Sicile." *RPh* 81 (2007), 229–42.

Cole, S. "Cicero, Ennius, and the Concept of Apotheosis at Rome." *Arethusa* 39 (2006), 531–48.

———. *Cicero and the rise of deification at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Conte, G. B. *Latin literature: a history.* tr. J. B. Solodow. rev. D. Fowler and G. W. Most. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Cornell, T. "Aeneas and the Twins: the Development of the Roman Foundation Legend." *PCPhS* 21 (1975), 1–32.

———. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars* (*c. 1000–264 B.C.*). London: Routledge, 1995.

———. "Cicero on the Origins of Rome." *Cicero's Republic*. edd. J. G. F. Powell and J. A. North. London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2001. 41–56.

———. "The Value of the Literary Tradition Concerning Archaic Rome." *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders.* ed. K. A. Raaflaub. Malden: Blackwell, 2005. 47–74.

Coudry, M. "Camille: construction et fluctuations de la figure d'un grande homme." *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique / Die Konstruktion der großen Männer Altroms: Actes du Colloque du Collegium Beatus Rhenanus, Augst 16–18 septembre 1999.* edd. M. Coudry and T. Späth. Paris: De Boccard, 2001. 47–81.

Crawford, M. *The Roman Republic.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

De Grummond, N. T. "Mariś, the Etruscan Genius." *Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians, Cypriots. Studies in Honour of David Ridgway Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway.* edd. E. Herring, I. Lemnos, et al. London: Accordia Research Institute, 2000. 413–26.

———. *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2006.

Delcourt, A. *Lecture des* Antiquités romaines *de Denys d'Halicarnasse. Un historien entre deux mondes.* Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 2005.

Dench, E. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Appenines.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

———. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Deuling, J. K. "Catullus and Mamurra." *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 188–94.

Develin, R. *Patterns in office-holding 366–49 B.C.* Brussels: Latomus, 1979.

Dillery, J. "Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco-Roman Historiography at Rome." *Vertis in Usum: Studies in Honor of E. Courtney.* edd. C. Damon, J. F. Miller, and K. S. Myers. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2002. 1–23.

Dougherty, C. "It's murder to found a colony." *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. edd. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993. 178–98.

Dowling, M. B. "The Clemency of Sulla." *Historia* 49 (2000), 303–40.

Dueck, D. "The date and method of composition of Strabo's *Geography*." *Hermes* 127 (1999), 467–78.

———. *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek man of letters in Augustan Rome.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Dulière, C. *Lupa Romana: Recherches d'Iconographie et Essai d'Interprétation.* 2 vols. Rome: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 1979.

Dumézil, G. *Archaic Roman Religion.* tr. P. Krappe. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Dunkle, J. R. "The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic." *TAPA* 98 (1967), 151–71.

Dyck, A. *A Commentary on Cicero,* De Legibus. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Eck, W., ed. *The Age of Augustus.* Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.

Eckstein, A. M. "Human Sacrifice and Fear of Military Disaster in Republican Rome." *AJAH* 7 (1982) 69–95.

———. *Senate and General: Individual Decision-Making and Foreign Relations, 264–194 B.C.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Edlund, I. E. M. "Must a king die? The death and disappearance of Romulus." *PP* 39 (1984), 401–8.

Edmondson, J. E., ed. *Augustus.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Edwards, C. *Writing Rome: Textual approaches to the city.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Elliott, J. "Livy's L. Papirius Cursor and the manipulation of the Ennian past." CQ 59 (2009), 650–3.

———. *Ennius and the Architecture of the* Annales. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Elm von der Osten, D. "The Cult of the Goddess *Libertas* at Rome and its Reflection in Ovid's Poetry and Tibullan Love Elegy." *Vergilius* 52 (2006), 32–44.

Erskine, A. "Hellenistic Monarchy and Roman Political Invective." CQ 41 (1991), 106–20.

Ertel, C., and K. S. Freyberger. "Nuove indagini sulla Basilica Aemilia nel Foro Romano." *ArchCl* 58 (2007), 109–42.

Evans, J. D. "The Sacred Figs in Rome." *Latomus* 50 (1991), 798–808.

———. *The Art of Persuasion: political propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Fabre-Serris, J. "Roman *Gentes* in Ovid's *Fasti. The Fabii and the Claudii.*" *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic.* edd. J. Farrell and D. P. Nelis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 89–106.

Fantham, E. "Recent Readings of Ovid's *Fasti.*" CP 90 (1995), 367–78.

———. "Images of the city: Propertius' new-old Rome." *The Roman Cultural Revolution.* edd. T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 122–35.

———. "Three Wise Man and the End of the Roman Republic." *Caesar against Liberty? Perspectives on his Autocracy*. edd. F. Cairns and E. Fantham. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Publications, 2003. 96–117.

———. *The Roman World of Cicero's* de Oratore. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

———. "*Discordia Fratrum*: Aspects of Lucan's Conception of Civil War." *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars.* edd. B. Breed, C. Damon, and A. Rossi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Farney, G. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Farrell, J. "Camillus in Ovid's *Fasti.*" *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic.* edd. J. Farrell and D. P. Nelis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 57–88.

Farrell, J., and D. P. Nelis, edd. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Fedeli, P. *Properzio: Il terzo libro delle elegie.* Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1985.

———. "La retorica dell'esempio mitico in Properzio." *Properzio tra storia arte mito.* edd. C. Santini and F. Santucci. Assisi: Accademia Properziana del Subasio, 2004. 231–57.

Fedeli, P., ed. *Sexti Properti Elegiarum libri IV.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

Feeney, D. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the problem of free speech under the Principate." *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, ed. A. Powell. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.

———. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Feig Vishnia, R. *State, Society and Popular Leaders in Mid-Republican Rome 214–167 BC.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Feldherr, A. "Livy's revolution: civic identity and the creation of the *res publica*." *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. edd. T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 136–57.

———. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's* History. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Ferrary, J.-L. "L'archéologie du *De Re Publica* (2.2,4–37,63): Cicéron entre Polybe et Platon." *JRS* 74 (1984), 87–98.

———. "Cicéron et la dictature." *Dictatures. Actes de la Table Ronde réunie à Paris les 27 et 28 février 1984*. Paris: De Boccard, 1988. 97–105.

———. "À propos des pouvoirs et des honneurs décernés à César entre 48 et 44." *Cesare: Precursore o visionario? Atti del convegno internazionale Cividale del Friuli, 17–19 settembre 2009*. ed. G. Urso. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2010. 9–30.

Ferriès, M.-C. "*Lvperci* et *Lvpercalia* de César à Auguste." *Latomus* 68 (2009), 373–92.

Fischer-Hansen, T. "Votive and Architectural Terracottas: The Archaic and Post-Archaic Period." *The Temple of Castor and Pollux II.2*. edd. K. Slej and M. Cullhed. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2008. 283–203.

Fishwick, D. "The name of the demigod." *Historia* 24 (1975), 624–8.

———. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Flach, D., ed. *Properz. Elegien.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011.

Flobert, P. "Deux Observations de Varron sur les Lupercales." *Hommages à Robert Schilling.* edd. H. Zehnacker and G. Hentz. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983. 93–9.

Flores, E. *Quinto Ennio Annali (libri I–VIII)*. vol. 1: text. Naples: Liguori Editore, 2002.

Flores, E., P. Esposito, G. Jackson, and D. Tomasco, eds. *Quinto Ennio Annali (libri I–VIII)*. vol. 2: commentary. Naples: Liguori Editore, 2002.

Flower, H. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. "The Tradition of the *Spolia Opima*: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus." *ClAnt.* 19 (2000), 34–64.

———. " 'Memories' of Marcellus: History and Memory in Roman Republican Culture." *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen—Autoren—Kontexte*. edd. U. Eigler, U. Gotter, and N. Luraghi. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003. 39–52.

———. *Roman Republics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Forsythe, G. "Some Notes on the History of Cassius Hemina." *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 326–44.
———. *The historian L. Capurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman annalistic tradition.* Lanham: University Press of America, 1994.
———. *Livy and early Rome: a study in historical method and judgment.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.
———. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
Fotiou, A. "A reconsideration of Cicero's *princeps civitatis* in the light of new evidence from a sixth-century political treatise." *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C. R. Trahman.* edd. D. F. Bright and E. S. Ramage. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984. 41–58.
Fox, M. *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1996.
———. *Cicero's Philosophy of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
Fraschetti, A. "Tarpeia Ambigua Vestale." *Properzio tra storia arte mito.* edd. C. Santini and F. Santucci. Assisi: Accademia Properziana del Subasio, 2004. 117–30.
———. *The Foundation of Rome*. tr. M. Hill and K. Windle. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
Freund, S. "*Pudicitia saltem in tuto sit*: Lucretia, Verginia und die Konstruktionen eines Wertbegriffs bei Livius." *Hermes* 136 (2008), 308–25.
Freyburger, G., and J. Scheid, eds. *Ciceron: de la divination.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1992.
Furuhagen, H. "Some Remarks on the Sculptured Frieze of the Basilica Aemilia in Rome." *OpRom* 3 (1961), 139–55.
Gabba, E. *Republican Rome, the army, and the allies.* tr. P. J. Cuff. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
———. *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
———. *Roma arcaica. Storia e storiografia*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2000.
Gaertner, J. F. "Livy's Camillus and the Political Discourse of the Late Republic." *JRS* 98 (2008), 27–52.
Galinsky, K. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
———. "Vergil's Uses of *Libertas*: Texts and Contexts." *Vergilius* 52 (2006), 3–19.
———, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Gantz, T. "The Tarquin Dynasty." *Historia* 24 (1975), 539–54.
Garani, M. "Propertius' temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the *spolia opima* (4.10): a poem not to be read?" *AC* 76 (2007), 99–117.
Gaughan, J. E. *Murder Was Not a Crime: Homicide and Power in the Roman Republic.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.

Geiger, J. "The tombs of Romulus and Remus. An overlooked source and its implications." *Athenaeum* 92 (2004), 245–54.

———. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the* Forum Augustum. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Gesche, H. *Die Vergottung Caesars*. Kallmünz: M. Lassleben, 1968.

Gigante, M. *Philodemus in Italy: The Books from Herculaneum*. tr. D. Obbink. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Gildenhard, I. "The 'Annalist' Before the Annalists: Ennius and His *Annales*." *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen—Autoren—Kontexte*. edd. U. Eigler, U. Gotter, and N. Luraghi. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003. 93–114.

———. "Reckoning with tyranny: Greek thoughts on Caesar in Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* in early 49." *Ancient Tyranny*. ed. S. Lewis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. 197–209.

———. *Paideia Romana. Cicero's Tusculan Disputations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

———. *Creative Eloquence: The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Giomini, R., ed. *M. Tulli Ciceroni scripta quae mansuerunt omnia XIV: De divinatione, de fato, Timaeus*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1975.

Gjerstad, E. "Pales, Palilia, Parilia." *Studia romana in honorem P. Krarup septuagenarii.* ed. K. Ascani. Odense: Odense University Press, 1976. 1–4.

Glinister, F., C. Woods, J. A. North, and M. H. Crawford, eds. *Verrius, Festus, and Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship, and Society.* London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2007. (= Glinister et al. 2007)

Goldberg, S. M. *Epic in Republican Rome.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Goold, G. P., ed. *Catullus.* London: Duckworth, 1983.

Gosling, A. "Sending up the founder: Ovid and the apotheosis of Romulus." *AC* 45 (2002), 51–69.

Gowing, A. *Empire and Memory: the representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Graf, F. "Der Mythos bei den Römern. Forschungs- und Problemgeschichte." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms.* ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 25–43.

Grandazzi, A. *The Foundation of Rome: Myth and History*. tr. J. M. Todd. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Gratwick, A. S. "Sicvti Fortis Eqvos [rev. of Skutsch 1985]." *CR* 37 (1987), 163–9.

Grebe, S. "Augustus' Divine Authority and Vergil's *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 50 (2004), 35–62.

Green, S. J. *Ovid* Fasti *1. A Commentary.* Leiden: Brill, 2004. (= 2004a)

———. "Playing with Marble: The Monuments of the Caesars in Ovid's *Fasti*." CQ 54 (2004), 224–39. (= 2004b)

———. "Malevolent Gods and Promethean Birds: Contesting Augury in Augustus' Rome." *TAPA* 139 (2009), 147–67.

Griffin, M. T., and E. M. Atkins, eds. *Cicero On Duty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Grimal, P. "Du *De Republica* au *De Clementia*: réflexions sur l'évolution de l'idée monarchique à Rome." *MEFRA* 91 (1979), 671–91.

Gruen, E. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1974.

———. *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Gurval, R. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotion of Civil War.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Gutberlet, D. *Die erste Dekade des Livius als Quelle zur gracchischen und sullanischen Zeit.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1985.

Guzzo, P. G. "I Dioscuri in Magna Graecia." *Castores: L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma.* ed. L. Nista. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1994. 27–31.

Hadszits, G. D. "History in the name of the Temple of Castor in the Forum." *Studies in Honor of J. C. Rolfe.* ed. G. D. Hadszits. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. 101–114.

Hahm, D. E. "Kings and constitutions: Hellenistic theories." *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought.* edd. C. J. Rowe and M. Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 457–76.

Hall, A. "Adidas and Puma bury the hatchet after 60 years of brothers' feud." *The Daily Telegraph* (*London*), 21 September 2009. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/germany/6215542/Adidas-and-Puma-bury-the-hatchet-after-60-years-of-brothers-feud.html Accessed August 1, 2014.

Hardie, P. "The Historian in Ovid. The Roman History of *Metamophoses* 14–15." *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. edd. D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis. Leiden: Brill, 2002. 191–209.

———, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Harmon, D. P. "[rev. of Ulf 1982]." *CJ* 81.1 (1985), 73–5.

Harries, B. "Causation and the authority of the poet in Ovid's *Fasti*." CQ 38 (1989), 164–85.

———. "Ovid and the Fabii: *Fasti* 2.193–474." CQ 41 (1991), 150–68.

Harris, W. V. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.

Harrison, S. J. "Augustus, the Poets, and the *Spolia Opima*." CQ 39 (1989), 408–14.

Haselberger, L. *Urbem Adornare: Die Stadt Rom und Ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus / Rome's Urban Metamorphosis under Augustus.* tr. A. Thein. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplements, 2007.

Havas, L. "Romulus Arpinas. Ein wenig bekanntes Kapitel in der römischen Geschichte des Saeculum-Gedankens." *ACD* 36 (2000), 71–88.

———. "Caesar als Romulus der Eroberer." *Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum 65. Geburtstag.* edd. H. Heftner and K. Tomaschitz. Vienna: Wiener Humanistischen Gesellschaft, 2004. 355–67.

Hellegouarc'h, J. *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des parties politiques sous le république*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1963.

———. "Le Principat de Camille." *Liberalitas: Scripta Varia*. edd. J. Dangel and F. Hinard. Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1998. 152–68.

Herbert-Brown, G. *Ovid and the* Fasti*: A Historical Study*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1994.

———, ed. *Ovid's* Fasti*: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Heyworth, S. J., and J. H. Morwood. *A Commentary on Propertius Book 3.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Hickson Hahn, F. *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the* Aeneid *of Vergil.* Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993.

Hierche, H. *Les Épodes d'Horace: Art et Signification*. Brussels: Latomus, 1974.

Hinard, F. "*De la dictature à la tyrannie*. Réflexions sur la dictature de Sulla." *Dictatures. Actes de la Table Ronde réunie à Paris les 27 et 28 février 1984*. Paris: De Boccard, 1988. 87–96.

———. *Svllana varia: Aux sources de la première guerre civile romaine*. Paris: De Boccard, 2008.

Hinds, S. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious Muse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

———. "*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*. Part 1: Genre and Mannerism." *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 81–112. (= 1992a)

———. "*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*. Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome, and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 113–153. (= 1992b)

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. *Rekonstruktionen einer Republik: Die politische Kultur des antiken Rome und die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte.* Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2004.

———. "Images of Power: Memory, Myth and Monuments in the Roman Republic." *SCI* 24 (2005), 249–71.

———. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: Ancient political culture and modern research*. tr. H. Heitmann-Gordon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Holleman, A. W. J. "An Enigmatic Function of the *Flamen Dialis* (Ovid, *Fast.*, 2.282) and the Augustan Reform." *Numen* 20 (1973), 222–8.

———. *Pope Gelasius I and the Lupercalia.* Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1974.

———. "Myth and Historiography: The Tale of the 306 Fabii." *Numen* 23 (1976), 210–8.

Holliday, P. J. *The Origins of Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

———. "The Rhetoric of *Romanitas*: The 'Tomb of the Statilii' Frescoes Reconsidered." *MAAR* 50 (2005), 89–124.

Holloway, R. R. *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Hölscher, T. "Historische Reliefs." *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik: Eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin 7. Juni–14. Augst 1988.* ed. W.-D. Heilmeyer. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1988. 351–400.

———. "Mythen als Exempel der Geschichte." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms.* ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 67–87.

———. "Monumenti statali e pubblico." *Monumenti statali e pubblico.* Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1994. 137–73.

———. "Augustus und die Macht der Archäologie." *La Révolution romaine après Ronald Syme: Bilans et perspectives.* Edd. A. Giovannini and F. Millar. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2000. 237–73.

———. *The Language of Images in Roman Art.* tr. A. Snodgrass and A. Künzl-Snodgrass. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. (= 2004b)

———. "Provokation und Transgression als politischer Habitus in der späten römischen Republik." *MDAI(R)* 111 (2004), 83–104. (= 2004a)

Horsfall, N. "Myth and Mythography at Rome." *Roman Myth and Mythography.* edd. J. Bremmer and N. Horsfall. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies, 1987. 1–11.

Hubaux, J. *Rome et Véies. Recherches sur la chronologie légendaire du moyen âge romain.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958.

Hutchinson, G. *Propertius. Elegies Book IV.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Ingleheart, J. "Propertius 4.10 and the end of the *Aeneid*: Augustus, the *Spolia Opima*, and the Right to Remain Silent." *G&R* 54 (2007), 61–81.

Itgenshorst, T. "Augustus und der republikanische Triumph: Triumphalfasten und *summi viri*- Galerie als Instrumente der imperialien Machtsicherung." *Hermes* 132 (2004), 436–58.

Jaeger, M. "*Custodia Fidelis Memoriae*: Livy's Story of M. Manlius Capitolinus." *Latomus* 52 (1993), 350–63.

———. *Livy's Written Rome.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

———. "Livy and the Fall of Syracuse." *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen—Autoren—Kontexte.* edd. U. Eigler, U. Gotter, and N. Luraghi. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003. 213–34.

Janssen, L. F. "Some Unexplored Aspects of the *devotio Deciana*." *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981), 357–81.

Jehne, M. "Krisenwahrnehmung und Vorschläge zur Krisenüberwindung bei Cicero." *Fondements et crises du pouvoir.* edd. S. Franchet d'Espèrey, V. Fromentin, S. Gotteland, and J.-M. Roddaz. Paris: De Boccard, 2003. 379–96.

Jocelyn, H. D. "*Urbs Augurio Augusto Condita*." *PCPhS* 17 (1971), 44–74.

———. "Catullus, Mamurra, and Romulus Cinaedus." *Sileno* 25 (1999), 97–113.

Johner, A. "Violence et conflit dans la légende des origines romaines." *Fondements et crises du pouvoir.* edd. S. Franchet d'Espèrey, V. Fromentin, S. Gotteland, and J.-M. Roddaz. Paris: De Boccard, 2003. 99–108.

Jordan, H. *Quaestiones Ennianae*. Königsberg: Hartungianis, 1885.

Kalyvas, A. "The Tyranny of Dictatorship: When the Greek Tyrant Met the Roman Dictator." *Political Theory* 35 (2007), 412–42.

Kampen, N. "Reliefs of the Basilica Aemilia: A Redating." *Klio* 78 (1991), 448–58.

Karakasis, E. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kearsley, R. "Octavian and Augury: The Years 30–27 B.C." *CQ* 59 (2009), 147–66.

Keaveney, A. "Sulla Augur." *AJAH* 7 (1982), 150–71.

———. *Sulla: The Last Republican.* London: Croom Helm, 1984.

———. "The Terminal Date of Sulla's Dictatorship." *Athenaeum* 93 (2005), 423–39.

Kennedy, D. F. " 'Augustan' and 'anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. ed. A. Powell. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1992. 26–58.

King, R. J. *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's* Fasti. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2006.

Kirk, G. S. "Aetiology, Ritual, Charter: Three equivocal terms in the study of myths." *YCS* 22 (1972), 83–102.

Knox, P., ed. *A Companion to Ovid.* Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Konstan, D. "Narrative and Ideology in Livy: Book 1." *ClAnt*. 5 (1986), 198–215.

Koortbojian, M. *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Köves-Zulauf, T. *Römische Geburtsriten.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1990. 221–89.

Kraggerud, E. *Horaz und Actium. Studien zu den politischen Epoden*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1984.

Krämer, H. J. "Die Sagen von Romulus und Remus in der lateinischen Literatur." *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt zum 15. März 1965 im Namen seiner Tübinger Schüler.* edd. H. Flashar and K. Gaiser. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske, 1965. 355–402.

Kränzle, P. *Die zeitliche und ikonographische Stellung des Frieses der Basilica Aemilia.* Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovaĉ, 1991.

Krarup, P. "Quelques remarques sur l'originalité de Cicéron dans ses ouvres politiques." *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à P. Boyancé.* Rome: École française de Rome, 1974. 455–60.

Kraus, C. S. "*Initium Turbandi Omnia a Femina Ortum Est*: Fabia Minor and the Election of 367 B. C." *Phoenix* 45 (1991), 314–25.
———. *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita Book VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
La Rocca, E. *Ara Pacis Augustae. In occasione del restauro della fronte orientale.* Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1983.
———. " 'Memoria di Castore': Principi come Dioscuri." *Castores: L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma.* ed. L. Nista. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1994. 73–90.
Labate, M. "L'esemplarità del passato: strategie di destabilizzazione nei *Fasti* di Ovidio." *Vates Operose Dierum, Studi sui* Fasti *di Ovidio.* ed. G. La Bua. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2010. 37–50.
Lange, C. H. Res Publica Constituta: *Actium, Apollo and the accomplishment of the triumviral assignment.* Leiden: Brill, 2009.
Langlands, R. "Roman Exempla and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero *de Officiis.*" *JRS* 101 (2011), 100–122.
Lasserre, F., ed. *Strabon. Géographie Tome III: Livres V et VI.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967.
Laurence, R. "Metaphors, monuments and texts: the life course in Roman culture." *World Arch.* 31 (2000), 442–55.
Leclercq, R. *Le Divin Loisir: Essai sur les* Bucoliques *de Virgile.* Brussels: Latomus, 1996.
Lee-Stecum, P. "Poet/Reader, Authority Deferred: Re-Reading Tibullan Elegy." *Arethusa* 33 (2000), 177–215.
Leigh, M. "Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome." *BICS* 40 (1995), 195–212.
Lennon, J. *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
Lewis, S., ed. *Ancient Tyranny*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
L'hoir, F. S. "Heroic Epithets and Recurrent Themes in Ab Urbe Condita." *TAPA* 120 (1990), 221–41.
Lincoln, B. "The Indo-European Myth of Creation." *History of Religions* 15 (1975), 121–45.
Linderski, J. "The Augural Law." *ANRW* II.16.3 (1986), 2146–312.
———. "Sannio and Remus." *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989), 90–93.
———. *Roman Questions.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.
———. "*Isto Vilius, Immo Carum*: Anecdotes about King Romulus." *AJP* 123 (2002), 587–99. (= 2002a)
———. "The pontiff and the tribune: the death of Tiberius Gracchus." *Athenaeum* 90 (2002), 339–66. (= 2002b)
———. "Founding the City: Ennius and Romulus on the Site of Rome." *Roman Questions II.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007. 3–19.
Lintott, A. *Violence in Republican Rome.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968.
———. "The Tradition of Violence in the Annals of the Roman Republic." *Historia* 19 (1970), 12–29.
———. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

———. *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Liou-Gille, B. "La sanction des *leges sacratae* et l'*adfectatio regni*: Spurius Cassius, Spurius Maelius et Manlius Capitolinus." PP 51 (1996), 161–97.

Lipps, J. "Sulla decorazione architettonica della Basilica Aemilia: un contributo alla cronologia dell'edificio di età imperiale." *ArchClass* 8 (2007), 143–53.

———. *Die Basilica Aemilia am Forum Romanum. Der kaiserzeitliche Bau und seine Ornamentik.* Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2011

Littlewood, R. J. "Ovid's Lupercalia (*Fasti* 2.267–452): A Study in the Artistry of the *Fasti*." *Latomus* 34 (1975), 1060–72.

———. "Ovid among the Family Dead." *Latomus* 60 (2001), 916–35.

———. "*imperii pignora certa*: The Role of Numa in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Ovid's* Fasti*: historical readings at its bimillennium*. ed. G. Herbert-Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 175–97.

Lloyd, R. B. "Superbus in the *Aeneid*." AJP 93 (1972), 125–132.

Lovano, M. *The Age of Cinna: Crucible of Late Republican Rome*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.

Luke, T. "Caesar as Rex? The *ovatio* of January 44 B.C." PLLS 15 (2012), 267–83.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. "Propertius and Tibullus: Early Exchanges." CQ 48 (1998), 519–44.

MacKay, C. S. *Ancient Rome: a military and political history.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Maltby, R. "Tibullus 2.5 and the Early History of Rome: A Comparison of Tibullus 2.5, Vergil's *Aeneid*, and Propertius 3.9 and 4.1." *Kleos* 7 (2002), 291–204. (= 2002a)

———. *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction, and Commentary.* Cambridge: Francis Cairns Publications, 2002. (= 2002b)

Mankin, D., ed. *Horace. Epodes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Manuwald, G. *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001.

Marchetti, P. "Autour de Romulus et des *Lupercalia*: Une exploration préliminaire." LEC. 70 (2002), 77–92.

Marcos Celestino, M. *El aniversario de la fundación de Roma y la fiesta de Pales.* Madrid: Signifer Libros, 2002.

Martin, P. M. "Cicéron *Princeps*." *Latomus* 39 (1980), 850–78.

———. *L'idée de royauté à Rome: des origines au consensus républicain.* Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982.

———. "Des tentatives de tyrannies à Rome aux Vè–IVè siècles?" *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik: Akten eines Symposiums 12.–15. Juli 1988, Freie Universität Berlin.* ed. W. Eder. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990. 49–72.

Massa-Pairault, F.-H. *Iconologia e politica nell'Italia antica: Roma, Lazio, Etruria dal VII al I sec. a.C.* Milan: Longanisi, 1992.

Massey, K. A. "A Second Look at Latin Secundus = 'Favorable.' " *Pomoerium* 5 (2004–6), 31–40.

Mastrocinque, A. *Lucio Giunio Bruto: Ricerche di storia, religione e diritto sulle origini della repubblica romana.* Trento: Edizioni La Reclame, 1988.

———. *Romolo* (*la fondazione di Roma tra storia e leggende*). Este: Libreria Editrice Zielo, 1993.

McClure, L. *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

McDermott, W. C. "Mamurra, *eques Formianus*." *RhM* 126 (1983), 292–307.

McGushin, P., ed. *Sallust: The Histories*. Vol I: Books i–ii. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1992.

Meier, C. *Caesar: A Biography*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.

Mencacci, F. *I fratelli amici: la rappresentazione dei gemelli nella cultura romana.* Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1996.

Meurant, A. *L'idée de gémellité dans la légende des origines de Rome.* Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 2000.

———. "D'Albe-la-Longue au *Pomerium*: Romulus et Rémus sur la route." *Latomus* 62 (2003), 517–42. (= 2003a)

———. "Quelques observations sur Celer, un autre double maudit de Romulus." *Hommages à Carl Deroux. IV. Archéologie et Histoire de l'Art, Religion*. ed. P. Defosse. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2003. 484–94. (= 2003b)

Michel, A. "Cicéron, philosophe romain." *Cicéron et Philodème: La polémique en philosophie.* edd. C. Auvray-Assayas and D. Delattre. Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm, 2001. 51–60.

Michels, A. K. "The Topography and Interpretation of the Lupercalia." *TAPA* 84 (1953), 35–59.

Miles, G. B. "*Maiores*, *Conditores*, and Livy's Perspective on the Past." *TAPA* 118 (1988), 185–208.

———. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Millar, F. "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic," *JRS* 74 (1984), 1–19. (= 1984a)

———. "State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy." *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects.* edd. F. Millar and E. Segal. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1984. 37–60. (= 1984b)

Miller, J. F. *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991.

———. "The *Fasti* and Hellenstic Didactic: Ovid's variant aetiologies." *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 11–31.

Miller, P. A. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Mineo, B. "Camille, *dux fatalis*." *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire: Vol. II: répresentations, récits, et idéologie*. edd. G. Lacheraud and D. Longrée. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003. 159–75.

Momigliano, A. "Some Observations on the *Origo Gentis Romanae*." *JRS* 48 (1958), 56–73.

Mommsen, T. *Römische Forschungen*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchgellschaft, 1879.

———. "Die Remuslegende." *Hermes* 16 (1881), 1–23.

Mora, F. *Fasti e schemi cronologici: La riorganizzazione annalistica del passato remoto romano.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.

Morgan, L. "Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus (*Aen*. 8.185–267)." *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. ed. H.-P Stahl. London: Duckworth, 1998. 175–97.

Morgan, T. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Morstein-Marx, R. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Mueller, L., ed. *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae.* Petropolis: C. Rickeri, 1884.

———, ed. *Sex. Propertii Elegiae.* Leipzig: Teuber, 1910.

Murgatroyd, P., ed. *Tibullus: Elegies II.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1994.

———. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Murgia, C. E. "Critica Varia." *Vertis in Usum: Studies in Honor of E. Courtney.* edd. C. Damon, J. F. Miller, and K. S. Myers. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2002. 67–75.

Muth, S. "Reglemente Erinnerung. Das Forum Romanum unter Augustus als Ort kontrollierter Kommunikation." *Kommunikationsräume im kaiserzeitlichen Rom.* ed. F. Mundt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012. 3–47.

Mynors, R. A. B. *Catulli Carmina.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1958.

Nagy, A. A., and F. Prescendi, edd. *Sacrifices humains: dossiers, discours, comparaisons. Actes du colloque tenu à l'Université de Genève, 19–20 mai 2011.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Nash, E. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. 2 vols. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1981.

Nau, F. "*Umbria Romani Patria Callimachi.* Le poète élégiaque et l'identité nationale romaine." *REL* 87 (2009), 114–19.

Neel, J. "Reconsidering the *affectatores regni*." *CQ*, forthcoming.

Nelsestuen, G. A. "Overseeing *res publica*: The *Rector* as *Vilicus* in *De Re Publica* 5." *ClAnt* 33 (2014), 130–73.

Newlands, C. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the* Fasti. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995. (= 1995a)

———. "The Ending of Ovid's *Fasti*." *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus essays for J. P. Sullivan.* ed. A. J. Boyle. Bendigo: Aureal Publications, 1995. 129–43. (= 1995b)

Nicholson, N. "Cultural Studies, Oral Tradition, and the Promise of Intertextuality." *AJP* 134 (2013), 9–21.

Nicoll, W. S. M. "The Death of Turnus." *CQ* 51 (2001), 190–200.

Nielsen, I., B. Poulsen, et al. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux I: The Pre-Augustan Temple.* Rome: De Luca Editori, 1992.

———. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux II: The Finds.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2008.

Nilson, K. A., C. B. Persson, S. Sande, J. Zahle, et al. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux III: The Augustan Temple.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1992 [2008].

Nora, P. *Les Lieux de Mémoire.* vol. 1. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.

North, J. A. "Caesar at the Lupercalia." *JRS* 98 (2008), 144–60.

Novokhatko, A. A., ed. *The Invectives of Sallust and Cicero: Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Oakley, S. "Single Combat in the Roman Republic." *CQ* 35 (1985), 392–410.

———. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X.* 4 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1997–2005. (vol. I = 1997; vol. IV = 2005b)

Ogilvie, R. M. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

———. *Early Rome and the Etruscans*. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976.

Orlin, E. M. *Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic.* Leiden: Brill 1997.

Osgood, J. "Caesar and Nicomedes." *CQ* 58 (2008), 687–91.

Paladini, V., ed. *C. Sallusti Crispi Orationes et Epistulae de historiarum libris excerptae*. 2nd ed. Bologna: Casa Editrice Prof. Riccardo Pàtron, 1967.

Palmer, R. E. A. "Jupiter Blaze, Gods of the Hills, and the Roman Topography of *CIL* VI 377." *AJA* 80 (1976), 43–56.

Parker, H. C. "*Romani numen soli:* Faunus in Ovid's *Fasti*." *TAPA* 123 (1993), 199–217.

Parker, H. N. "Why Were the Vestals Virgins? Or the Chastity of Women and the Safety of the Roman State." *AJP* 125 (2004), 563–601.

Parker, R. *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1983.

Pasco-Pranger, M. "Added Days: Calendrical Poetics and the Julio-Claudian Holidays." *Ovid's* Fasti*: historical readings at its bimillennium*. ed. G. Herbert-Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 251–74.

Pausch, D. "Der aitiologische Romulus. Historisches Interesse und literarische Form in Livius' Darstellung der Königszeit." *Hermes* 136 (2008), 38–60.

Peirano, I. "Hellenized Romans and Barbarized Greeks. Reading the End of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*." *JRS* 100 (2010), 32–53.

Pelling, C. B. R. "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives." *JHS* 99 (1979), 74–96.

Penwill, J. L. "Image, Ideology and Action in Cicero and Lucretius." *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus essays for J. P. Sullivan.* ed. A. J. Boyle. Bendigo: Aureal Publications, 1995. 68–91.

Perelli, L. *Il pensiero politico di Cicerone: Tra filosofia greca e ideologia aristocratica romana.* Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1990.

Peter, H. *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.

Peterson, H. "Livy and Augustus." *TAPA* 92 (1961), 440–62.

Petrocchi, G. A. B. "L'iconografia dei Disocuri sui denari della repubblica romana." *Castores: L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma.* ed. L. Nista. Rome: De Luca Editore, 1994. 101–5.

Pfaff-Reydellet, M. "Étiologies multiples et 'hasards' du calendrier: la construction du discours ovidien dans la sequence des Parilia (*F.* IV, 721–862)." *L'étiologie dans la pensée antique*. ed. M. Chassignet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008. 101–113.

Phillips, C. R. "Roman religion and literary studies of Ovid's *Fasti*." *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 55–80.

Pina Polo, F. "The Tyrant Must Die: Preventative Tyrannicide in Roman Political Thought." *Républicas y ciudadanos: modelos de participación cívica en el mundo antiguo.* edd. F. M. Símon, F. Pina Polo, and J. Remesal Rodríguez. Barcelona: Publications i edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 2006. 71–101.

Pittenger, M. R. P. *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Pogorzelski, R. "The 'Reassurance of Fratricide' in the *Aeneid*." *AJP* 130 (2009), 261–89.

Pomathios, J.-L. *Le pouvoir politique et sa représentation dans l'*Énéide *de Virgile.* Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 1987.

Porte, D. "Un épisode satirique des *Fastes* et l'exil d'Ovide." *Latomus* 43 (1984), 284–306.

———. *L'Étiologie religieuse dans les* Fastes *d'Ovide*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985.

Potter, D. "Holding Court in Republican Rome (105–44)." *AJP* 132 (2011), 59–80.

Poucet, J. "Fabius Pictor et Denys d'Halicarnasse. Les enfances de Romulus et de Rémus." *Historia* 25 (1976), 201–16.

———. "L'influence des facteurs politiques dans l'évolution de la geste de Romulus." *Sodalitas: Scritti in onore di Antonio Guarino*. ed. V. Giuffre. Vol. 1. Naples: Jovene, 1984. 1–10.

———. *Les Origines de Rome: Tradition et histoire.* Brussels: Facultés universitaires Saint-Louis, 1985.

———. *Les Rois de Rome: Tradition et histoire.* Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 2000.

Poulsen, B. "The Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology." *SymbOsl.* 66 (1991), 119–46.

———. "Cult, Myth, and Politics." *The Temple of Castor and Pollux I.* edd. I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1992. 46–53. (= 1992a)

———. "The Written Sources." *The Temple of Castor and Pollux I.* edd. I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1992. 54–60. (= 1992b)

———. "Ideologia, mito e culto dei Castores a Roma: dall'età repubblicana al tardo-antico." *Castores: L'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma.* ed. L. Nista. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1994. 91–5.

Powell, J. G. F. "The *rector rei publicae* of Cicero's *De Republica*." *SCI* 13 (1994), 19–29.

———, ed. *M. Tulli Ciceronis: De re publica; De legibus; Cato maior de senectute; Laelius de amicitia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Powell, J. G. F., and J. A. North. "Introduction." *Cicero's Republic*. edd. J. G. F. Powell and J. A. North. London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2001. 1–5.

Puhvel, J. "Remus et Frater." *HR* 15 (1975), 146–57.

Purcell, N. "Becoming Historical: The Roman Case." *Myth, History, and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman.* edd. D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2003. 12–40.

Putnam, M. C. J. "Romulus *Tropaeophoros* (*Aeneid* 6.779–80). *CQ* 35 (1985), 237–40.

Quinn, K. *Catullus: the Poems*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1970.

Raaflaub, K. "Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth-Century Athenian Democracy." *Popular Tyranny: sovereignty and its discontents in ancient Greece.* Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2003. 59–93.

Raaflaub, K., and M. Toher, edd. *Between Republic and Empire: interpretations of Augustus and his principate.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Radke, G. "Anmerkungen zu den Ersten fünf *Feriae Publicae* der römischen Fasten." *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift für Walter Pötscher.* edd. J. Dalfen, G. Petersmann, and F. F. Schwartz. Vienna: Verlag F. Berger u. Söhne Gesellschaft m.b.H., 1993. 177–93.

Rawson, E. *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1991.

Rea, J. *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline.* London: Duckworth, 2007.

Rebeggiani, S. "Reading the Republican Forum: Virgil's *Aeneid*, the Dioscuri, and the Battle of Lake Regillus." *CP* 108 (2013), 53–69.

Reggiani, R. "Silla *Peior atque Intestabilior* e *Scaevus Romulus* (Nota a Sall. *Hist.* 1, 55, 1 e 5 M)." *Athenaeum* 82 (1994), 207–21.

Reizenstein, R. "Zu Cicero *De re publica*." *Hermes* 59 (1924), 356–62.

Rich, J. W. "The supposed Roman manpower shortage of the later second century BC." *Historia* 32 (1983), 287–331.

Richard, J.-C. "Variations sur le thème de la fondation de Rome." *Condere Urbem*. ed. C. M. Ternes. Luxemburg: Publications du Centre universitaire de Luxembourg, 1992. 135–53.

———, ed. *Pseudo-Aurelius Victor.* Origo Gentis Romanae. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983.

Richardson, J. H. "L. Iunius Brutus the Patrician and the Political Allegiance of Q. Aelius Tubero." *CP* 106 (2011), 155–60.

———. *The Fabii and the Gauls: Studies in Historical Thought and Historiography in Republican Rome.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012.

Richardson, L., ed. *Propertius.* Elegies *I–IV*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977.

Ridley, R. T. "Eulogy of the Lost Republic or Acceptance of the New Monarchy? Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*." *Antichthon* 44 (2010), 68–95.

———. “The Historian’s Silences: What Livy Did Not Know.” *JAH* 1 (2013), 27–52.

Robb, M. A. *Beyond* Populares *and* Optimates*. Political Language in the Late Republic.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010.

Robinson, M. J. *Ovid* Fasti *Book II.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Rodriguez-Mayorgas, A. “Romulus, Aeneas, and the Cultural Memory of the Roman Republic.” *Athenaeum* 98 (2010), 89–109.

Roller, D. W. “Euripides, Ennius, and Roman Origins.” *AncWorld* 27 (1996), 168–71.

Roller, M. B. *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

———. “Exemplarity in Roman culture: the cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia.” *CP* 99 (2004), 1–56.

———. “Demolished Houses, Monumentality, and Memory in Roman Culture.” *ClAnt* 29 (2010), 117–80.

———. “On the Intersignification of Monuments in Augustan Rome.” *AJP* 134 (2013), 119–31.

Rosenblitt, J. A. “The *devotio* of Sallust’s Cotta.” *AJP* 132 (2011), 397–427.

Rosenstein, N. S. Imperatores Victi: *Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

———. “Competition and Crisis in Mid-Republican Rome.” *Phoenix* 47 (1993), 313–38.

Ross, D. O., Jr. “[Rev. of Skutsch 1985].” *CP* 83 (1988), 251–60.

Ruiz Sánchez, M. *Confectum Carmine: En torno a la poesía de Catulo*. vol. 2. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1996.

Rüpke, J. “Acta aut agenda: Relations of Script and Performance.” *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome Held at Stanford University in February 2002.* edd. A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke, and S. Stephens. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004. 23–44.

———. “Historicizing Religion: Varro’s *Antiquitates* and History of Religion in the Late Roman Republic.” *HR* 53 (2014), 246–68.

Sachs, E. “Some Notes on the Lupercalia.” *AJP* 84 (1963), 266–79.

Salmon, E. T. *Samnium and the Samnites.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Santangelo, F. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East.* Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Divination, Prediction, and the End of the Roman Republic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Santini, C., ed. *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina.* Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1995.

Sauzeau, P., and A. Sauzeau. *La quatrième fonction: altérité et marginalité dans l’idéologie des Indo-Européens*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2012.

Schäublin, C., ed. *Marcus Tullius Cicero über die Wahrsagung* (de Divinatione). Munich: Artemis and Winkler, 1991.

Scheid, J. "Cultes, mythes et politique au début de l'Empire." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms.* ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 109–27.

———. *La religion des Romains*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1998.

———. "Les frères arvales, ou comment construire une étiologie pour une restauration religieuse." *L'étiologie dans la pensée antique*. ed. M. Chassignet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008. 293–303.

Schilling, R. "Ovide poète des 'Fastes'." *Hommages Jérôme Carcopino.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966. 863–72.

———. "Ovide interprète de la religion romaine." *REL* 46 (1969), 222–35.

———. "Romulus l'élu et Remus le réprouvé." *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1979. 103–20. (= *REL* 38 [1961], 182–99).

Schofield, M. "Approaching the *Republic*." *The Cambridge History of Political Thought.* edd. C. Rowe, M. Schofield et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 190–232.

———. "Fraternité, inégalité, la parole de Dieu : Plato's authoritarian myth of political legitimation." *Plato's Myths.* ed. C. Partenie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Scholz, U. W. "Zur Erforschung der römischen Opfer (Beispiel: die Lupercalia)." *Le Sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*. edd. J. Rudhardt and O. Reverdin. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1981. 289–340.

Schultze, C. E. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his audience." *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing. Papers presented at a conference in Leeds, 6–8 April 1983.* edd. I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, and A. J. Woodman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. 121–41.

Scott, K. "The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus." *TAPA* 56 (1925), 82–105.

———. "Drusus, Nicknamed Castor." *CP* 25 (1930), 155–61. (= 1930a)

———. "The Dioscuri and the Imperial Cult." *CP* 25 (1930), 379–80. (= 1930b)

Scullard, H. H. *Roman politics, 220–150 B.C.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973.

———. *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1981.

———. *From the Gracchi to Nero*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Seager, R. "*Populares* in Livy and the Livian Tradition." *CQ* 27 (1977), 371–90.

Segura Moreno, M., ed. *Quinto Ennio. Fragmentos.* Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1984.

Sehlmeyer, M., ed. Origo Gentis Romanae: *Die Ursprünge des römischen Volkes.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004.

Settis, S. "Die Ara Pacis." *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik: Eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin 7. Juni–14. Augst 1988.* ed. W.-D. Heilmeyer. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1988. 400–26.

Shaya, J. "The Public Life of Monuments: The *Summi Viri* of the Forum of Augustus." *AJA* 117 (2013), 83–110.

Sihvola, J. "Il culto dei Dioscuri nei suoi aspetti politici." *Lacus Iuturnae.* Vol. I. ed. E. M. Steinby. Rome: De Luca Editori, 1989. 76–91.

Simon, E. "Fragmente vom Fries der Basilica Aemilia." *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom.* ed. W. Helbig, H. Speier. 4th ed., vol. 2. Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1966. 834–43.

———. *Ara Pacis Augustae*. Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1967.

Skinner, M. B. "Parasites and Strange Bedfellows: A Study in Catullus' Political Imagery." *Ramus* 8 (1979), 137–52.

———. "The Dynamics of Catullan Obscenity." *SyllClass* 3 (1991), 1–12.

———. "*Ego mulier*: The Construction of Male Sexuality in Catullus." *Helios* 20 (1993), 107–30.

Skutsch, O. "Enniana III." *CQ* 10 (1960), 188–98. (= *Studia Enniana*, 46–61)

———. "Enniana IV: Condendae urbis auspicia." *CQ* 11 (1961), 252–67. (= *Studia Enniana*, 62–85)

———. *Studia Enniana.* London: The Athlone Press, 1968.

———. *The* Annals *of Quintus Ennius.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1985.

Smit, B. *Pitch Invasion: Three Stripes, Two Brothers, One Feud: Adidas, Puma, and the Making of Modern Sport.* London: Penguin Books, 2006.

Smith, C. J. "The *Origo Gentis Romanae*: Facts and Fictions." *BICS* 48 (2005), 97–136.

———. "*Adfectatio Regni* in the Roman Republic." *Ancient Tyranny*. ed. S. Lewis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. 49–64.

———. "Caesar and the history of early Rome." *Cesare: precursore o visionario? Atti del convegno internazionale Cividale del Friuli, 17–19 settembre 2009.* ed. G. Urso. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2010. 249–64.

Smith, S. C. "Brutus as Earthborn Founder of Rome (Livy 1.56)." *Mnemosyne* 60 (2007), 285–93.

Solmsen, F. "Propertius in his literary relations with Tibullus and Vergil." *Philologus* 105 (1961), 273–89.

Sordi, M. "Caesar's Powers in his last Phase." *Caesar against Liberty? Perspectives on his Autocracy.* edd. F. Cairns and E. Fantham. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Publications, 2003. 190–9.

Spannagel, M. Exemplaria Principis. *Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte, 1999.

Spawforth, A. J. S. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Stahl, H. P. *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Stanton, G. R. "Why Did Caesar Cross the Rubicon?" *Historia* 52 (2003), 67–94.

Starr, R. J. "*Annos undeviginti natus*: Augustus and Romulus in *Res gestae* 1.1." *Historia* 58 (2009), 367–9.

Staveley, E. S. "The Significance of the Consular Tribune." *JRS* 43 (1953), 30–6.

———. "The Constitution of the Roman Republic, 1940–1954." *Historia* 5 (1956), 74–122.

Steinbock, B. "A Lesson in Patriotism: Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*, the Ideology of the Ephebeia, and Athenian Social Memory." *ClAnt* 30 (2011), 279–317.

Stem, R. "The Exemplary Lessons of Livy's Romulus." *TAPA* 137 (2007), 435–71.

Šterbenc Erker, D. "Das Lupercalia-Fest im augusteischen Rom: Performativität, Raum und Zeit." *AfR* 11 (2009), 1–34.

Steuart, E. M., ed. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.

Stevenson, T. "*Parens Patriae* and Livy's Camillus." *Ramus* 29 (2000), 27–46.

———. "Readings of Scipio's dictatorship in Cicero's *De Re Publica* (6.12)." *CQ* 55 (2005), 140–52.

Stewart, R. *Public office in early Rome: ritual, procedure and political practice.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Stover, T. "Aeneas and Lausus: Killing the Double and Civil War in *Aeneid* 10." *Phoenix* 65 (2011), 352–60.

Stok, F. "L'ambiguo Romolo dei *Fasti*." *Cultura poesia ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio*. edd. I. Gallo and L. Nicastri. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1991. 183–212.

Strasburger, H. *Zur Sage von der Gründung Roms.* Heidelberg: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1968.

Strong, D. E. *Roman Art*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976.

Strzelecki, L. *Quaestiones Verrianae.* Warsaw: Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, 1932.

Suerbaum, W., ed. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band: Die archaische Literatur.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 2002.

Sumi, G. S. "Monuments and Memory: The *Aedes Castoris* in the Formation of Augustan Ideology." *CQ* 59 (2009), 167–86.

Syme, R. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.

Syndikus, H. P. *Catull. Eine Interpretation. Erster Teil: Die kleinen Gedichte (1–60).* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschft, 1984.

Takacs, L. "The Image of Camillus in Livy's Book 5 and 6." *ACD* 44 (2008), 205–11.

Talbert, R. J. A. "Augustus and the Senate." *G&R* 31 (1984), 55–63.

Tanner, J. "Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic." *JRS* 90 (2000), 18–50.

Tatum, W. J. *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Thomas, J. *L'imaginaire de l'homme romain: dualité et complexité.* Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2006.

Thomas, R. *Vergil. Georgics Books III–IV.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Thomson, D. F. S. *Catullus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Tiffou, E. "Notes sur le personnage de Romulus." *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine: Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon.* 2 vols. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1976. 991–9.

Timpanaro, S. "[Rev. of Skutsch 1968]." *Gnomon* 42 (1970), 354–64.

———, ed. *Cicerone: Della divinazione*. Milan: Garzanti, 1999.

Toher, M. "Julius Caesar and Octavian in Nicolaus." *Caesar against Liberty? Perspectives on his Autocracy.* edd. F. Cairns and E. Fantham. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Publications, 2003. 132–56.

Torelli, M. "Un *templum augurale* d'età repubblicana a *Bantia*." *RAL* 21 (1966), 293–315.

———. "Contributi al supplemento del *CIL* LX." *RAL* 24 (1969), 9–48.

Tortorella, S. "L'adolescenza dei gemelli, la festa dei *Lupercalia* e l'uccisione di Amulio." *Roma: Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*. ed. A. Carandini. Electa, 2000. 244–55.

Ulf, C. *Das römische Lupercalienfest*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.

Urso, G., ed. *Cesare: precursore o visionario? Atti del convegno internazionale Cividale del Friuli, 17–19 settembre 2009*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2010.

Usherwood, J. R., M. Stavrou, J. C. Lowe, K. Roskilly, and A. M. Wilson. "Flying in a flock comes at a cost in pigeons." *Nature* 474 (June 2011), 494–7. http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v474/n7352/abs/nature10164.html. Accessed May 31, 2014.

Vahlen, J., ed. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963.

Valditara, G. "Attualità del pensiero politico di Cicerone." *Cicerone e la politica: Atti del convegno di Diritto romano, Arpino, 29 gennaio 2004*. Naples: Satura Editrice, 2004. 83–117.

Valvo, A. "Le vincende de 43–34 a.C. nella tradizione di Livio e di Dionigi su Spurio Melio." *Storiografia e propaganda. Contributi dell'Istituto della Storia 3.* ed. M. Sordi. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1975. 157–83.

van Haeperen, F. "Mises à mort rituelles et violence politiques à Rome sous la République et sous l'Empire." *Res Antiquae* 2 (2005), 327–46.

Vangaard, J. H. "On Parilia." *Temenos* 7 (1971), 90–103.

Vansina, J. *Oral Tradition and History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Várhelyi, Z. "The Specters of Roman Imperialism: The Live Burials of Gauls and Greeks at Rome." *ClAnt* 26 (2007), 277–304.

Vasaly, A. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

ver Eecke, M. "De l'Aventin au Palatin: le nouvel ancrage topographique de Rémus au moment du passage de la République à l'Empire." *DHA* 32 (2006), 75–94.

———. *La République et le Roi: le mythe de Romulus à la fin de la République romaine.* Paris: De Boccard, 2008.

Verbrugghe, G. "Fabius Pictor's 'Romulus and Remus'." *Historia* 30 (1981), 236–8.

Versnel, H. "Two Types of Roman *Devotio*." *Mnemosyne* 29 (1976), 365–410.

Vervaet, F. J. "The *lex Valeria* and Sulla's empowerment as dictator (82–79 BCE)." *CGG* 15 (2004), 37–84.

Vigourt, A. "L'intention criminelle et son châtiment: les condamnations des aspirants à la tyrannie." *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique / Die Konstruktion der großen Männer Altroms: Actes du Colloque du Collegium Beatus Rhenanus, Augst 16–18 septembre 1999.* edd. M. Coudry and T. Späth. Paris: De Boccard, 2001. 271–87.

Villeneuve, F., ed. *Horace. Tome I: odes et épodes.* rev. J. Hellegourc'h. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1991.

von Ungern-Sternberg, J. "Romulus-Bilder: Die Begründing der Republik im Mythos." *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms.* ed. F. Graf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993. 88–108.

———. *Römische Studien: Geschichtsbewußtsein—Zeitalter der Gracchen—Krise der Republik*. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2006.

Walbank, F. W. "Polybius on the Roman Constitution." *CQ* 37 (1943), 73–89.

———. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Vol I: Books I–VI.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. "*Mutatio morum*: the idea of a cultural revolution." *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. edd. T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 3–22.

———. "*Mutatas Formas*: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge." *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus.* ed. K. Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 55–84.

Walsh, P. G. "Livy's Preface and the Distortion of History." *AJP* 76 (1955), 369–383.

———. *Livy: His historical aims and methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Walt, S., ed. *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer: Einleitung, Fragmente, Kommentar*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1997.

Walter, U. Memoria *und* res publica. *Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom.* Frankfurt: Verlag Antike, 2004.

Wardle, D. "The Sainted Julius: Valerius Maximus and the Dictator." *CP* 92 (1997), 323–45.

———, ed. *Cicero* On Divination. *Book 1.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2006.

Watson, L. C. *A Commentary on Horace's* Epodes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Weeber, K-W. "Properz IV 1, 1–70 und das 8. Buch der *Aeneis*." *Latomus* 37 (1978), 489–506.

Weinstock, S. *Divus Julius.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.

Welch, K. "*Lux* and *lumina* in Cicero's Rome." *Roman Crossings.* edd. K. Welch and T. W. Hillard. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2005. 313–37.

Welch, T. S. *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2005.

White, G. "Epilogue: Memory Moments." *Ethos* 34 (2006), 325–41.

Wiedemann, T. "Reflections of Roman political thought in Latin historical writing." *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. edd. C. Rowe, M. Schofield et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 517–31.

Williams, C. A. *Roman Homosexuality.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Winter, J. G. *The Myth of Hercules at Rome.* London: Macmillan and Co., 1910.

Wirszubski, C. *Libertas as a political idea at Rome during the late Republic and early Principate.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Wiseman, T. P. "Mallios." *CR* 15 (1965), 263.

———. "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome." *G&R* 21 (1974), 153–64.

———. *Clio's Cosmetics: three studies in Greco-Roman literature.* Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979. (= 1979a)

———. "Topography and Rhetoric: The Trial of Manlius." *Historia* 28 (1979), 32–50. (= 1979b)

———. "The She-Wolf Mirror: An Interpretation." *PBSR* 61 (1993), 1–6.

———. "The God of the Lupercal." *JRS* 85 (1995), 1–22. (= 1995b); also published in *Unwritten Rome* (= 2008b)

———. *Remus: a Roman Myth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. (= 1995a)

———. *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2004.

———. "The Legend of Lucius Junius Brutus." *Unwritten Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2008. 293–305. (= 2008a)

———. "A Puzzle in Livy." *G&R* 56 (2009), 203–10. (= 2009a)

———. *Remembering the Roman People: Essays on Late-Republican Politics and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. (= 2009b)

Yakobson, A. *Elections and Electioneering in Rome: A Study of the Political Systems of the Late Republic*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.

Yardley, J. C. *Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's* Epitome *of Trogus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Zachos, K. "Excavations at the Actian Tropaeum at Nikopolis. A preliminary report." *Foundation and Destruction: Nikopolis and Northwestern Greece. The Archaeological evidence for the city destructions, the foundation of Nikopolis and the synoecism*. ed. J. Isager. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2001. 29–41.

Zanker, P. *Forum Augustum: Das Bildprogramm.* Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1968.

———. "Bilderzwang: Augustan Political Symbolism in the Private Sphere." *Image and Mystery in the Roman World: Three Papers given in memory of Jocelyn Toynbee.* edd. J. Huskinson, M. Beard, and J. Reynolds. Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1988. 1–22.

———. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. tr. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.

———. *Un'arte per l'impero. Funzione e intenzione delle immagini nel mondo romano.* ed. E. Polito. Milan: Electa, 2002.

Zecchini, G. *Cesare e il* mos maiorum. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001.

———. "Sylla selon Salluste." *CGG* 13 (2002), 45–55.

Zetzel, J. E. G. "Citizen and Commonwealth in *De Re Publica* Book 4." *Cicero's Republic*. edd. J. G. F. Powell and J. A. North. London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2001. 83–97.

———. "The Influence of Cicero on Ennius." *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*. edd. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 1–16.

———, ed. *Cicero.* De Re Publica*. Selections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Ziolkowski, A. "Ritual Cleaning-Up of the City: From the Lupercalia to the Argei." *AncSoc* 29 (1999), 191–218.

Index

Accius 190
Acilius 26 n. 9, 91 n. 9
Actium 77 n. 86, 82 n. 108, 131, 133, 140, 149, 150, 152 n. 35
Aelius Tubero 20, 73 n. 72, 94, 97, 183–187, 237
Aemilius Lepidus (cens. 179) 28–32, 59
Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78) 57, 62, 66–67
Alföldi, A. 117, 122
Amulius 2, 6, 24–26, 94, 103, 171, 175–176, 181–190, 194, 215
Antony 84, 98–101, 118, 133, 139, 140, 143, 168, 190, 236
augury *See* foundation
Augustus 4, 19, 21, 23, 61, 67, 74–76, 84, 87, 91, 99, 109–110, 117–118, 121–143, 145, 148–150, 154, 158–161, 164–173, 190, 207–208, 211, 234

Basilica Aemilia 30 n. 21, 124–127; fig. 1
Beck, H., and U. Walter 22, 49–50, 52, 183 nn. 25, 27, 30, 213 n. 23, 218 n. 49
Brutus the Liberator 9, 23, 102, 156, 164, 175, 179, 190–206, 211, 222–223, 231, 233–237

Caesar *See* Julius Caesar
Calpurnius Piso (Frugi) 20, 22, 48 n. 108, 52 n. 120, 93, 184 n. 36, 190 n. 59, 196 n. 83
Camillus 3, 23, 153, 205, 207–220, 223, 231, 233–237
Cassius Hemina 20, 22, 27, 34, 49–55, 88, 101, 149–150, 163 n. 73, 171, 182 n. 22
Castor and Pollux 15, 134–137, 139, 165
Catiline 68–70, 73, 113, 199, 201, 224, 233–234
Cato the Elder 20, 22, 28, 52 n. 120, 77 n. 87, 78, 93, 148 n. 24, 151 n. 33, 184 n. 36
Catullus 54, 62–65, 66, 69, 71, 73, 79, 87, 116, 163
Celer 47, 75, 147–148, 161–164, 167–168, 179
Chassignet, M. 22, 50 n. 112, 52 n. 120, 183 nn. 27, 30
Cicero 3, 16, 27, 28 n. 16, 101, 102, 112–117, 135, 155 n. 44, 182, 207, 208 n. 2, 214, 221, 224–234, 236
and Brutus (the Liberator) 196, 202–204
and Ennius 29, 33–34, 40–42, 45
and Romulus 54, 57, 59, 65–70, 73, 75, 77–82, 85–87, 150, 169, 176, 179
Cincius Alimentus 73 n. 72, 93, 146
Claudius Quadrigarius 73 n. 72, 213–214, 218–219
Collatinus 24, 178, 180 n. 17, 191–206
Competition 1, 12, 13 n. 39, 14, 18–19, 23–24, 27–28, 31–33, 35, 39, 42–43, 45–46, 48, 50–51, 53–56, 72, 86–87, 91–98, 100, 103, 113, 117–119, 123, 139, 140, 144, 159, 162, 172–173, 175, 181, 192, 208, 213, 216, 236–237
Conon 27 n. 10, 171 n. 106
consul 3, 5, 9, 19, 30–34, 39, 40, 51, 55, 63, 78 n. 93, 137, 150, 174, 191, 194–198, 201, 216 n. 38, 223, 230, 237
Cornell, T. J. 5 n. 11, 7 n. 19, 21 n. 56, 22, 78, 183 n. 30

devotio 37–38, 47–48, 145 n. 15
dictator 55 n. 5, 61, 70, 88, 99, 100, 166, 213–214, 219, 220, 230
Diodorus Siculus 20, 27, 74 n. 72, 75–76, 146–148, 162, 171 n. 106, 188, 214–215
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 73–75
on Amulius 183–185, 188
on Brutus 190, 193–201
on Romulus and Remus 26–27, 93–97, 142–149, 162–163
Dioscuri, Dioskouroi *See* Castor and Pollux
dyadic rivalry, definition 14–18, 175–176

Elliott, J. 28 n. 13, 33, 39 n. 66, 47
Ennius 2, 10, 20, 48–54, 71, 87–88, 96, 101, 114–115, 144, 146, 157, 169, 181–182, 185, 205, 214, 217, 219, 228
Esquiline tomb frescoes *See* Tomb of the Statilii frescoes

Fabius Pictor 2, 20, 22 n. 61, 26 n. 6, 73 n. 72, 93–94, 146, 171 n. 106, 182–185, 205
Faustulus 26, 75 n. 77, 93, 128–130, 131 n. 50, 145, 165, 185
Festus 22, 25 n. 2, 43–45, 46 n. 99, 163 n. 72
Forum Augustum 125–126, 131–134, 161 n. 66

foundation 5–10, 17, 23, 25–53, 68–69, 76, 78–80, 82–87, 103–113, 140–174, 176, 178, 180, 182, 189–191, 200, 204, 205, 223
Fulvius Nobilior (cens. 179) 28–32, 59

Gabba, E. 61, 74, 146 n. 19, 221 n. 58
Gracchus, Tiberius (tr. pl. 133) 52, 55–56, 75–76, 87, 224, 234

Hemina *See* Cassius Hemina
Hercules 15, 79, 122–123
Homer 39–40, 76, 167–168
Horace 27, 76, 82–87, 106, 130, 139, 143, 146, 148, 151, 153 n. 36, 173, 176, 181, 189, 205

Julius Caesar 4, 57–59, 61–64, 72, 79–81, 86, 88, 91, 98–103, 110–118, 132, 143, 156, 164–168, 173, 190, 196, 199, 203, 207, 211, 228, 234, 237

king *See* regnum; tyrant
kingship *See* regnum

late Republic 3–4, 18–19, 21, 54–88, 93–95, 98–103, 110–118, 120–124, 142–149, 176–178, 182, 186–187, 191–192, 196, 202–203, 225, 227–228, 233–237
Licinius Macer (tr. pl. 73) 20, 22, 26 nn. 6, 8, 58–59, 73 n. 72, 75, 145, 182 n. 22, 185–186
Livy 13, 20, 29–32, 43 n. 89, 48–50, 102, 114 n. 117, 126, 175–176, 205, 207, 233–235
  and Amulius 6, 181, 184–187, 189–190
  and Brutus 190–198, 201–202, 204–220, 223–234
  and Camillus 3–4, 207–234
  and Romulus and Remus 25–27, 41, 58, 60, 72, 73–77, 90, 92–93, 95–98, 120, 141–149, 167–168, 173
  and Titus Tatius 111, 176–179
lot 31–32, 42, 50–51, 192
Lucretia 5, 190–191, 194 n. 71, 201
lupa 26, 83–85, 92–93, 106, 108, 119–122, 129–131, 141, 149–155
Lupercalia 27, 33 n. 35, 44 n. 95, 89–103, 110, 113, 114, 117–118, 156, 171, 211 n. 13, 236
luperci 91–92, 94–96, 98–103, 110, 118, 237

Maecenas 140, 152–154
Marius 40, 55–57, 59, 67–68, 132, 207, 208 n. 2, 211, 234
Mars 26, 44 n. 93, 114, 117–118, 122–123, 131–133, 157, 186

Naevius 20, 181–182, 185
numismatics 85 n. 119, 98 n. 36, 121–122, 135 n. 67, 203 n. 117
Numitor 2, 6, 24–26, 94, 103, 171, 175–176, 181–190, 194, 215

Oakley, S. 32 n. 34, 75 n. 80, 94 n. 20, 185 n. 40, 209 n. 4, 211 n. 17, 216–218, 219
Octavian *See* Augustus
Ogilvie, R. M. 5 n. 7, 76 n. 82, 163 nn. 72, 74, 192 n. 65, 199, 208 n. 2, 210 n. 7, 211
OGR 21–22, 25, 46 n. 98, 75, 182 n. 22, 185–186, 192 n. 66
optimates 57–58, 224, 227 n. 79
Ovid 13, 16 n. 44, 20, 44 nn. 92, 93
  and death of Remus 27, 110, 161–168
  and Livy 167–168
  and Romulus 169–170, 179–180
  and Romulus and Remus 41, 75, 90 n. 5, 95–97, 110
  and Vergil 6 n. 14, 166–167

Parilia 91, 103–113, 117, 119, 126
plebs 3 n. 1, 5, 9, 30–32, 55, 65, 76, 120, 121, 132, 155, 191 n. 62, 202, 208, 217, 219, 224
Plutarch 21, 36, 57–58, 62, 70–72, 91 n. 9, 183–184, 219, 234 n. 117
Polybius 3, 171 n. 106, 221
Pompeius Trogus 20, 130 n. 47, 170–172
Pompey (Magnus) 58, 59, 62–64, 70–72, 77, 79–81, 88, 99–100, 116, 164 n. 81, 190, 211, 227–228, 234
populares 57–58, 75, 219, 224
Postumius Albinus 190
princeps 4, 5, 10, 19, 21, 23, 79, 87, 97, 126, 134–137, 140–141, 148, 150, 153 n. 36, 159–161, 173, 208, 228, 236
Propertius 10 n. 33, 20, 96, 106–110, 111, 113, 119, 123, 142, 152–158, 160, 173

Quirinus 80–81, 98, 112–118, 122–123, 149–150, 164

rector 225–233
regnum 7–9, 18–19, 34–35, 48–53, 60, 66–73, 78–80, 86–87, 98–103, 117, 132–133, 136–137,

regnum (*cont.*)
166–168, 176–194, 200–201, 209–212, 215, 219–225, 229–230, 233
Remus 2, 5–6, 8–11, 15, 17, 25–27, 48–54, 59–60, 65, 66, 72, 89–99, 102–103, 105–106, 119, 121, 128–130, 133–136, 138–139, 141, 175–176, 178, 181–184, 187, 190, 192, 200, 202, 207, 215–216, 236; fig. 2, 3
and augury 32–45, 122–124, 192
death 6–7, 9–11, 45–48, 73, 75–88, 103, 110, 116, 140–174
Romulus 2, 5–11, 25–28, 33–182, 187–192, 202–203, 205, 209–212, 215, 236; fig. 1–3
and augury 32–45, 122–124, 192
and death of Amulius 188–190
and death of Remus 46–48, 73–87, 103, 110, 116
and foundation of Rome 34–53, 66–69, 103–104, 144–168, 171
and Quirinus 114–115, 123, 149–150
and Titus Tatius 107–108, 125–126, 176–181
as tyrant 10, 54, 57, 60–66, 69, 71–73, 86, 88, 102, 176, 210
as youth 26, 91–97, 122, 128–130, 188–189
Romulus and Remus *See* Romulus; Remus

Sabine 5, 47, 111, 125, 152 n. 35, 171 n. 105, 175–177, 180, 211
Sallust 20, 57–58, 62, 65–70, 141, 199
Scipio Africanus 28, 51, 112, 208 n. 2, 210 n. 7
Scipio Aemilianus 69, 78, 121
and the *rector* 225–229, 232
and Tiberius Gracchus 76, 167–168
senate 3, 5, 28–32, 55–56, 60 n. 22, 70, 72, 98–99, 102, 112, 116, 132, 135, 154, 156, 171, 229, 233
Servius 22, 166 n. 90, 182, 199
Servius Tullius 7 n. 22, 102 n. 59, 209–212
Sibyl 104–106, 109, 156–157
Skutsch, O. 29 n. 19, 35 n. 42, 36–43, 46–47, 71 n. 67, 115 n. 115, 178 n. 8, 214 nn. 26, 31
Smith, C. J. 21 nn. 56, 60, 22, 207 n. 1
sortitio *See* lot
Strabo 27 n. 10, 135 n. 66, 171, 186, 188 n. 53
Sulla 10, 44, 55–59, 61, 66–67, 70–71, 73, 75–76, 132, 141, 187, 210 n. 7, 211, 227 n. 81, 234

Tarquin 5, 7 n. 22, 9 n. 28, 58 n. 18, 178 n. 7, 184 n. 31, 190–204, 207 n. 1, 221 n. 58, 229–231, 233
Tibullus 20, 104–108, 153 n. 39, 156
Titus Tatius 2, 60, 73, 108–109, 24, 111, 114, 141, 175–181, 194, 216
Tomb of the Statilii frescoes 124–125, 127–130; fig. 2, 3
triumph 18, 30–31, 52 n. 124, 69 n. 58, 84, 87, 98, 116, 209, 211–212
Turnus 17, 126–127, 151–152, 199
twin *See* dyadic rivals, definition; Romulus and Remus
tyranny *See* regnum
tyrant 10, 48, 54, 56–58, 60–62, 65–69, 71–73, 86, 88, 94, 98, 102, 132, 176, 178 n. 8, 186 n. 46, 189, 193 n. 69, 195–196, 198–201, 204–206, 207–234

Valerius Antias 20, 26 n. 8, 73 n. 72, 75 n. 78, 182 n. 22, 186, 214, 219 n. 53
Varro 20, 40 n. 70, 44 n. 92, 69 n. 58, 90 n. 3, 92, 100, 109 n. 82, 182 n. 22
Ver Eecke, M. 2, 9 n. 29, 10, 36–37, 44, 50, 56–58, 61, 64, 66–67, 70–73, 75, 103, 111, 145, 164–166, 173, 178 n. 8, 208 n. 2
Vergil 6 n. 14, 20, 46, 142, 160
Aeneid 104 n. 68, 149–152, 156 n. 48, 163 n. 74, 179
and Brutus 199–200, 204
Georgics 166–168
Verrius Flaccus. *See* Festus

Walter, U. *See* Beck, H. and U. Walter
Weinstock, S. 111–112, 122
Wiseman, T. P. 2, 5–6, 9–10, 27 n. 10, 37, 38 nn. 62–63, 40 n. 69, 45 n. 96, 50 n. 112, 65, 76, 80 n. 99, 94, 97, 103 n. 61, 120–121, 123, 147, 153, 154 n. 40, 162–163, 166 n. 90, 171 n. 106, 180, 192, 194, 214, 218